

R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 002 950

24

THE ROLE BEHAVIOR OF SCHOOL PRINCIPALS.

BY- GROSS, NEAL AND OTHERS

HARVARD UNIV., CAMBRIDGE, MASS., GRAD. SCH. OF EDUC.

REPORT NUMBER CRP-853-3

PUB DATE AUG 65

CONTRACT OEC-SAE-8702

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.45 HC-\$12.00 300P.

DESCRIPTORS- *BEHAVIOR PATTERNS, *LEADERSHIP, BEHAVIOR STANDARDS, SOCIOLOGY, *ROLE PLAYING, *PRINCIPALS, PUBLIC EDUCATION, URBAN SCHOOLS, *SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION, TEACHER SUPERVISION, STATISTICAL SURVEYS, SELF CONCEPT, LEARNING, PERFORMANCE FACTORS, TEACHER ATTITUDES, PARENT SCHOOL RELATIONSHIP, ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL, INNOVATION, CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

THE EFFECTS AND DETERMINANTS OF THREE ROLE BEHAVIOR ASPECTS OF SCHOOL PRINCIPALS WERE STUDIED, AS FOLLOWS--(1) CLOSENESS OF TEACHER SUPERVISION, (2) SUPPORT OF INNOVATION, AND (3) INVOLVEMENT OF PARENTS IN SCHOOL AFFAIRS. SPECIFICALLY, THE EFFECTS AND DETERMINANTS TO BE EXAMINED WERE THE ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTS OF ROLE BEHAVIOR IN TERMS OF TEACHER MORALE, THE PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE OF TEACHERS, PUPIL LEARNING, AND THE DETERMINANTS OF VARIATIONS AMONG PRINCIPALS IN THEIR CONFORMITY TO SELF-DEFINED ROLE EXPECTATIONS. THIS REPORT REPRESENTS THE THIRD OF SEVERAL MONOGRAPHS THAT PRESENTED THE FINDINGS OF THE NATIONAL PRINCIPALSHIP STUDY, "A COMPREHENSIVE INVESTIGATION OF THE ROLE OF SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN PUBLIC EDUCATION." DATA WERE OBTAINED FROM A MULTIREGIONAL SAMPLE OF APPROXIMATELY 500 ELEMENTARY, JUNIOR HIGH, AND SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS, INCLUDING THEIR TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATIVE SUPERVISORS, WHOSE SCHOOLS WERE LOCATED IN OVER 40 LARGE CITIES ACROSS THE UNITED STATES. THE EMPIRICAL FINDINGS FROM THIS SURVEY OF EFFECTS AND DETERMINANTS OF ROLE BEHAVIOR PATTERNS WERE PRESENTED FOR THEIR IMPACT AT EACH SCHOOL LEVEL (ELEMENTARY, JUNIOR HIGH, AND SENIOR HIGH), I.E., POSITIVE RELATIONSHIPS OR NO RELATIONSHIP. THE POSITIVE RELATIONSHIP INFERENCES REFERRED TO WERE BASED UPON A ZERO-ORDER PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENT, POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE IN DIRECTION, AT OR BELOW THE .05 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE. (JH)

THE ROLE BEHAVIOR OF SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Robert Dreeben and Neal Gross

Graduate School of Education

Harvard University

Final Report No. 3

August 1965

The research reported herein was performed under Contract No. 853 (SAE-8702) with the Cooperative Research Branch, United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

ED002950

NATIONAL PRINCIPALSHIP STUDY

SENIOR RESEARCH STAFF

Director

Neal Gross

Research Associates

Peter C. Dodd

Paul E. Kelly

Robert Dreeben

Keith W. Prichard

Robert E. Herriott

Anne E. Trask

Joseph L. Hozid

Dean K. Whitla

PREFACE

This is the third of several monographs presenting the results of the National Principalship Study, a research program in the sociology of education sponsored by Harvard University and performed under Contract SAE-8702 with the Cooperative Research Branch, U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It constitutes the final report of the part of the Study that focused on the effects and determinants of three aspects of the principals' role behavior: closeness of supervision, support of innovation, and involvement of parents in school affairs. Earlier reports presented findings on two other major problems examined in the Study: the professional leadership exhibited by principals as the executives of their schools, and the role performance and reactions to their work of men and women as school administrators. A fourth will concern the role conflicts to which principals are exposed and their correlates.

A year of preliminary planning was devoted to the design of the total Study. This phase of the research was performed under Contract SAE-8371 with the Cooperative Research Branch, U.S. Office of Education. A second proposal was then submitted to the Cooperative Research Branch for support of a nation-wide study of principals in city school systems, one that would also involve their teachers and their higher administrators. It was approved in the summer of 1960. The field-work phase of the Study was initiated in the latter part of 1960 and completed in the spring of 1961.

Since the inquiry reported in these pages as well as the other investigations of the National Principalship Study were conducted as part of

a large-scale research program, it would not have been possible to undertake or complete them without the cooperation and collaboration of a large number of individuals. We wish to acknowledge our indebtedness to the senior staff: Peter C. Dodd, Robert E. Herriott, Joseph L. Hozid, Paul E. Kelly, Keith W. Prichard, Anne E. Trask, and Dean K. Whitla. In addition, to participating in the design of the overall Study, they prepared research materials, supervised field work activities in many cities, and conducted most of the interviews. The senior staff also served as editors and coders (or supervisors of coding) for both the questionnaire and interview data. Peter C. Dodd, Joseph L. Hozid, and Anne E. Trask were centrally involved in coding the open-ended interview materials. Robert E. Herriott coordinated the development of the many research instruments and supervised the extensive computer programming, data reduction, and statistical analyses for the many parts of the Study. His skills in research methodology contributed to the research in numerous ways. Keith W. Prichard and Paul E. Kelly reviewed relevant bodies of social science and educational literature with considerable skill. Dean K. Whitla had primary responsibility for developing and carrying out the sampling procedures. He also served as Associate Director of the Study during the first two years of the research program.

The following individuals provided valuable services as research assistants during different periods of the Study: Philip S. Bonacich, Hugh Cline, Nathan Gross, David Hill, George W. Perry, Nancy St. John, Norman A. Sprinthall, and Larry A. Weiss.

The staff was advised at several crucial stages of the inquiry on various statistical problems by the following individuals: Hubert M. Blalock, William G. Cochran, John B. Carroll, Arthur P. Dempster, C. Frederick Mosteller, Howard Raiffa, and John Tukey. Their cooperation and advice is acknowledged with considerable gratitude.

We are also indebted to the following individuals who augmented the senior staff in the data collection phase of the Study: John Clark, James M. Coffee, Mario D. Fantini, Harold L. Hodgkinson, and Miriam Lieber.

In addition, a number of Harvard Faculty Aides provided many helpful services to the Study. These include: Stephen Call, William L. Hamilton, Walter O. Jewell, III, Jeffrey Jordan, David Napior, Frank Newman, Roger D. Olney, Douglas Ridge, and Sanford Ungar. Stephen Call and Walter O. Jewell, III, deserve special recognition in this connection for the outstanding services they rendered in the program development and data processing phases of the Study.

Richard Labrie and Charles Cantor of the Harvard Statistical Laboratory were also of considerable assistance in developing computer programs to facilitate the data processing phase of the work. We are particularly indebted to Michael V. Solomita of the M.I.T. Computation Center and Robert Burns of the Harvard Computing Center for their assistance in making arrangements for data processing. Between January 1961 and September 1963 the statistical work presented in this report was done in part at the M.I.T. Computation Center. After September 1962,

additional data processing was performed at the Harvard Computing Center and supported by a grant (GP 683) from the National Science Foundation to Harvard University.

Important clerical or computational tasks were performed by: Virginia Coates, Cynthia W. Cole, Edward Copeland, Roger Hussey, Jane Kelly, Annette B. Miller, and Antoinette Shelter.

There are several other people who deserve special comment because of their contributions to the Study. Nathan Jacobson and Donald J. Blyth were extremely generous in sharing their wisdom with the staff about the role and problems of school principals. Herold C. Hunt and Robert H. Anderson also stimulated our thinking about many issues in educational administration. The encouragement and support of Francis Keppel, Dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Education when the Study was initiated, and of individuals such as Calvin E. Gross, Finis E. Engleman, Forrest E. Connor, and Benjamin C. Willis are also gratefully acknowledged.

Marion L. Crowley served as the secretary of the Study, and we are indebted to her for her many valuable contributions. Charlene Worth, too, ably carried out her many secretarial and related responsibilities.

Five hundred and one principals, 3,367 teachers, and 128 higher administrators in 41 large American cities participated in the Study. Without the full cooperation of these educators and the endorsement and support of the Study by their school superintendents and school boards, it would not have been possible to undertake the research program. We are greatly appreciative of their interest in this endeavor and the time and effort

they devoted to it. We hope that the research findings presented in this and the other reports of the Study will constitute some repayment for their cooperation. Despite all the help received, however, we alone are accountable for the shortcomings of this report.

Robert Dreeben
Neal Gross

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study</u>	1 - 1
<u>Chapter 2: Role and Organizational Analysis: Concepts and Theoretical Issues</u>	2 - 1
The Conceptual Scheme	2 - 1
Role Analysis	2 - 1
Organizational Analysis	2 - 4
Role Segmentation and the Convergence of Role and Organizational Analysis	2 - 11
The Principalship in Organizational Perspective	2 - 14
School Board and Superintendent	2 - 15
Higher Administrators and Principals	2 - 16
Principals and Teachers	2 - 17
Teachers and Pupils	2 - 18
Principal and Community	2 - 21
School Level	2 - 22
Role Performance: Effects and Determinants	2 - 24
<u>Chapter 3: Research Methods</u>	3 - 1
Preliminary Activities	3 - 1
Population and Sample	3 - 3
Data Collection	3 - 4
Data Processing and Summarization	3 - 7
The Measurement of Patterns of Role Expectations and Role Performance	3 - 9
Patterns of Role Expectations for the Performance of Principals	3 - 10
The Principals' Pattern of Role Performance	3 - 19

Chapter 4: <u>The Effects of Principals' Role Performance on Their Schools</u>	4 - 1
Teachers' Morale	4 - 1
Closeness of Supervision	4 - 2
Support of Innovation	4 - 10
Principals' Involvement of Parents in School Affairs	4 - 12
Teacher Effort	4 - 16
Closeness of Supervision	4 - 17
Support of Innovation	4 - 19
Principals' Involvement of Parents in School Affairs	4 - 21
Pupil Academic Performance	4 - 23
Closeness of Supervision	4 - 25
Support of Innovation	4 - 26
Principals' Involvement of Parents in School Affairs	4 - 28
 <u>Chapter 5: Conformity to Self-expectations for Role Performance: The Theoretical Formulation and Methodological Issues</u>	 5 - 1
The Theoretical Framework	5 - 1
Methodological Issues	5 - 4
 <u>Chapter 6: Closeness of Supervision</u>	 6 - 1
Teacher Characteristics	6 - 1
Teacher Expectations	6 - 2
Teacher Competence	6 - 3
Teacher Loyalty to the Principal	6 - 12

Teacher Satisfaction with the Principal's Leadership	6 - 15
Higher Administrator Characteristics	6 - 17
Higher Administrator Expectations	6 - 17
Principal Participation in Staff Recruitment	6 - 22
Principal Characteristics	6 - 26
Principal Self-expectations	6 - 26
Sharing of Responsibility with Teachers	6 - 27
Principals' Skills: Instruction and Human Relations	6 - 31
Organizational Properties of Schools	6 - 34
School Size	6 - 36
Variance in Teacher Age	6 - 38
 <u>Chapter 7: Support of Innovation</u>	 7 - 1
Teacher Characteristics	7 - 2
Teacher Expectations	7 - 3
Teacher Competence	7 - 4
Teacher Loyalty to the Principal	7 - 8
Higher Administrator Characteristics	7 - 8
Higher Administrator Expectations	7 - 10
Principal Participation in Staff Recruitment	7 - 13
Characteristics of Principals	7 - 14
Age	7 - 14
Authoritarian Values	7 - 17
Years Spent as a Teacher	7 - 22

Principals' Skills: Instruction and Human Relations	7 - 25
Sharing of Responsibility with Teachers	7 - 25
Dealing with the Community	7 - 30
Principal Self-expectations	7 - 32
Conflict between Pupil and Teacher Interests	7 - 35
Socio-economic Status of Schools	7 - 36
 <u>Chapter 8: Involvement of Parents in School Affairs</u>	 8 - 1
Teacher Characteristics	8 - 1
Teacher Expectations	8 - 2
Teacher Academic Preparation	8 - 3
Teacher Loyalty to the Principal	8 - 5
Teacher Satisfaction with the Principal's Leadership	8 - 7
Higher Administrator Characteristics	8 - 10
Higher Administrator Expectations	8 - 10
Principal Characteristics	8 - 13
Dealing with the Community	8 - 13
Sharing of Responsibility with Teachers	8 - 14
Principals' Skills: Human Relations	8 - 17
Principal Self-expectations	8 - 19
Criteria for Evaluating Schools: Pupils' Social and Emotional Development, Pupils' Academic Achievement	8 - 22
Conflict between Pupil and Teacher Interests	8 - 27
Socio-economic Status of Schools	8 - 28

Chapter 9: Summary

9 - 1

Teacher Morale: The Effects of Principals' Role Behavior on the Operation of Their Schools

9 - 3

Teacher Effort: The Effects of Principals' Role Behavior on the Operation of Their Schools

9 - 3

Pupil Academic Achievement: The Effects of Principals' Role Behavior on the Operation of Their Schools

9 - 3

Closeness of Supervision: Determinants of Principals' Conformity to Self-Expectations

9 - 4

Support of Innovation: Determinants of Principals' Conformity to Self-Expectations

9 - 5

Involvement of Parents in School Affairs: Determinants of Principals' Conformity to Self-Expectations

9 - 7

Appendix A: Specimen Questionnaires

A - 1

Section of the Teacher Questionnaire Used to Obtain Descriptions of the Principals' Role Behavior

A - 2

Section of the Teacher Questionnaire Used to Obtain Measures of Pupil Academic Performance, Teacher Morale, Teacher Effort, and Teacher Loyalty

A - 5

Section of the Principal Role Questionnaire Used to Obtain Self-Expectations for Behavior

A - 8

Section of the Interview Schedule Used to Measure Principals' Criteria for Evaluating Schools

A - 16

Appendix B: Guttman Scales and Factor Weights Used in the Measurement of Variables

B - 1

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

This is the report of an inquiry conducted as part of the National Principalship Study dealing with three aspects of the role behavior of principals at the elementary, junior high, and senior high school levels: the supervision of teachers, support of innovation, and involvement of parents in school affairs.¹ This investigation had two main objectives: (1) to examine the organizational effects of role behavior in terms of teacher morale, the professional performance of teachers, and pupil learning; and (2) to investigate possible determinants of variation among principals in their conformity to self-defined role expectations. In examining these problems we shall use the conceptual tools of role and organizational analysis. We shall focus then on variations in role behavior as they pertain to the overall operation of schools, and with variations in role behavior viewed as conformity to the expectations principals hold for themselves.

There were both scientific and practical reasons for exploring these problems. As social scientists we hoped to contribute to our limited knowledge about how the behavior of executives affects the operation of their organizations and about the conditions associated with their patterns of behavior. We also hoped to explore provocative questions for practitioners who participate daily in the life of the school.

On the scientific side, there were a number of reasons for undertaking this study. First, there is a large literature dealing with the impact of various types of supervisory activities on organizational operation (most usually, worker morale and productivity) in which supervision is treated very much on an ad hoc basis -- interesting in its own right -- but not as one particular type of role behavior of which there

are many.² Although supervision is an important activity in the functioning of organizations there is no a priori reason for thinking that other types of role behavior are not equally important. For this reason, we include support of innovation and client involvement in an effort to begin widening the inquiry of the effects of role behavior on organizations.

Second, again in regard to supervision, the literature pertaining to its organizational impact is largely inconclusive, and the findings of a number of investigations are contradictory.³ Leaving aside methodological issues, we suggest that the different relationships discovered between similar variables in these studies may reflect their contextual nature. Thus, if in one investigation close supervision is related to low worker morale and in another to high morale, these findings in themselves may not necessarily be contradictory if one takes into account salient characteristics of the organizational settings in which the studies were carried out. We adopt such a conditional strategy in this investigation.

Third, there are many investigations in which the questions of conformity or deviance to group or societal norms represent the main issue. Studies of delinquency provide one good example.⁴ There has been far less concern, however, with the problem of discovering the conditions under which individuals conform or deviate from self-imposed expectations. There is good reason to believe that individuals bring to work situations ideas about the way they should perform and that they vary in their conformity to their own standards. This is a question just as important as whether an individual does what others expect him to do; and one that sociologists, probably for historical reasons, have not seen as falling within their bailiwick.

In regard to practical considerations, we wanted to explore questions of practical importance to those whose work centers around the operation of schools. In the area of school administration, one finds advocates of a close-supervision policy as well as advocates of a loose-supervision policy. Essentially, though, there are simply advocates; the literature on supervision over a wide range of organizations is at best inconclusive, and within the educational field, there is insufficient evidence for providing even rough guidelines for choosing one supervisory strategy over another.⁵

In the areas of innovation and parental participation in school affairs, there is the widely-held sentiment that administrators should encourage both of these activities.⁶ Yet, in both cases, empirical evidence about the impact of these activities of principals is almost non-existent. It is our intention to explore issues related to all three courses of action and to provide empirical findings that will stimulate school personnel at least to examine the assumptions underlying current practice even if our data do not provide the basis for definitive courses of action under specific circumstances.

One of our basic premises is that the principalship is an important position in the organizational context of schools. Principals are the subject of our inquiry because, as educational administrators, they are responsible for the management of schools; they are held accountable for the efficiency and effectiveness of their organizations.⁷

They have a great number of responsibilities; they are supposed to:

- (1) orient new teachers by making them aware of their formally defined

rights and obligations; (2) see that all staff members carry out their teaching and extra-curricular responsibilities at least at a minimum level of satisfactory performance; (3) cope with problems arising out of personal misunderstandings and conflicts; (4) deal with problems of deviant behavior that so often arise out of rationally designed efforts to run a stable organization; (5) implement policy decisions made at higher levels in the school system; (6) resolve the conflicts presented by teachers and parents who are disgruntled or apathetic; (7) interpret the school program to the community served; (8) assess the capabilities of teachers. In short, principals occupy a strategic managerial position at the lower levels of the school system bureaucracy; they are the administrative officials with the closest contact to the core functions of schools: teaching and learning.

The investigation reported here was carried out as part of the National Principalship Study, a research program designed to examine problems of concern both to social scientists and educators. Data were obtained from a sample of 501 principals (including those working at the elementary, junior high, and senior high school levels), whose schools were located in 41 large cities in all regions of the United States. In addition, a considerable body of data was obtained from their teachers and administrative superiors. By using a variety of research techniques described in Chapter Three, we attempted to find answers to many questions in addition to those considered here.⁸

In succeeding chapters, we concern ourselves with the following topics:

Chapter Two presents the scheme employed for conceptualizing the relationship of role behavior to organizational structure and operation. In Chapter Three we describe our research methods and deal with methodological issues, including the measurement of the following patterns of role expectations and behavior: supervision, support of innovation, and parental participation, the central variables of this investigation. Chapter Four contains our analysis of organizational effects: the relationship between each type of role behavior and teacher morale, teacher competence, and student learning. Chapter Five presents the key theoretical ideas underlying our analyses of circumstances related to conformity to self-expectations. Chapters Six, Seven, and Eight contain the empirical findings. In Chapter Nine, we present the summary of the findings and the major conclusions.

Notes and References for Chapter One

1. For the findings of other studies carried out as part of the National Principalship Study, see Neal Gross and Robert E. Herriott, The Professional Leadership of Elementary School Principals, Final Report No. 1, Cooperative Research Project No. 853, April 1964; and Neal Gross and Anne E. Trask, Men and Women as Elementary School Principals, Final Report No. 2, Cooperative Research Project No. 853, June 1964.

2. See, for example, Robert Dubin, "Supervision and Productivity: Empirical Findings and Theoretical Considerations," in Robert Dubin, et al., Leadership and Productivity (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1965), pp. 1-50; Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, Formal Organizations (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1962); Amitai Etzioni, A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1961); Rensis Likert, New Patterns of Management (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1961); and Michael Argyle, et al., "Supervisory Methods Related to Productivity, Absenteeism, and Labour Turnover," Human Relations, XI (1958), pp. 23-40.

3. Dubin, op. cit., p. 3.

4. See, for example, Richard A. Cloward and Lloyd E. Ohlin, Delinquency and Opportunity: A Theory of Delinquent Gangs (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1960); and Albert C. Cohen, Delinquent Boys, (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1955).

5. See William H. Lucio and John D. McNeil, Supervision: A Synthesis of Thought and Action (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1962).

6. See, for example, Paul B. Jacobson, William C. Reavis, and James D. Logsdon, The Effective School Principal (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1954), Chapters V, VII, and XXII; and Herold C. Hunt and Paul R. Pierce, The Practice of School Administration (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1958), Chapters II, VII, and XI.

7. See, for example, Paul R. Pierce, The Origin and Development of the Public School Principalship (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1935); William C. Reavis and Charles H. Judd, The Teacher and Educational Administration (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1942); "The Elementary School Principalship--Today and Tomorrow," Twenty-seventh Yearbook, The National Elementary Principal, Department of Elementary School Principals, National Education Association (1948); William C. Reavis, et al., Administering the Elementary School (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1953); Charles R. Spain, Harold D. Drummond, and John I. Goodlad, Educational Leadership and the Elementary School Principal (New York: Rinehart and Company, 1956); and Arthur B. Moehlman, School Administration: Its Development, Principles and Function in the United States (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1951).

8. For a detailed discussion of the research techniques used in other parts of the National Principalship Study, see Gross and Herriott, op. cit., Chapter II; and Gross and Trask, op. cit., Chapter I.

Chapter 2: Role and Organizational Analysis: Concepts and Theoretical Issues

In this chapter we present the concepts and theoretical ideas underlying our investigation of the two main problems of our inquiry: (1) the impact of the principals' behavior on the operation of their schools; and (2) the social and psychological conditions associated with the principals' conformity to their own role expectations. To fulfill these as well as other objectives of the National Principalship Study, we needed to conceptualize the expectations for and behavior of principals and aspects of the organizational settings in which they work -- schools. Our conceptual scheme takes into account the individuals who occupy a single position -- the principalship, the properties of that position, and the characteristics of the organizational setting in which it is located. We shall employ the conceptual resources of role analysis and organizational analysis and shall attempt to demonstrate the mutual relevance of concepts drawn from these two areas of inquiry that hitherto have developed independently of each other.

The Conceptual Scheme

Role Analysis

Our conceptualization of principals' behavior and the expectations pertaining to it is rooted in a language for role analysis found useful in a previous study.¹ It was developed in order to solve certain theoretical and operational problems encountered in using previous definitions of role and to bring some kind of order into the welter of meanings given this term by social scientists.²

An appraisal of previous formulations of role presented in Explorations

in Role Analysis revealed that, despite terminological differences, three fundamental ideas occur in most conceptualizations: persons ". . . (1) in social locations (2) behave (3) with reference to expectations."³ The scheme we use here is based on these ideas and contains six elements: position, expectations, role, role definers, role behavior, and patterns of role behavior.

Position. This term is defined as the location of an actor or class of actors in a system of social relationships. In school settings, a number of clearly differentiated positions can be identified: those of principal, teacher, pupil, guidance counselor, and custodian.⁴

A position is always part of a network of positions. The principalship, for example, belongs to a network containing the positions of teacher, parent, and pupil, among others. The behavior of a principal, then, has meaning in the context of the larger network of which his own is a part. By implication, then: "Whatever the implications of the label, a position cannot be completely described until all the other positions to which it is related have been specified."⁵ For most research inquiries, however, it is only possible to examine empirically one or a few linkages among all positions in a social system.⁶

Positions may be studied at various levels of situational inclusiveness. For example, a principalship could be studied solely in the context of a single elementary school in one neighborhood; similarly, it could be studied at the elementary and secondary levels in all school systems throughout the United States. However, an investigator would not learn the same things from each study. It is necessary, then, to

specify the precise context in which the position in question will be investigated.⁷ In this study we are concerned with the principalship and its relationships to the positions of teacher, higher (or system-wide) administrator, pupil, and parent in elementary, junior high, and senior high schools in American cities with populations of 50,000 and over.

Expectations. We have defined positions as locations in a system of social relationships. The concept has reference only to the location itself and not to the rights, duties, and obligations applied to its incumbent; nor does the term position tell us anything specific about the performance of its occupants. We need concepts, therefore, to refer to both of these phenomena since we view the behavior patterns of individuals occupying a position in part as a function of the expectations applied to it.

If attention is directed to how individuals should behave, one focuses on expectations. We define an expectation as an evaluative standard applied to an incumbent of a position. Such standards involve two dimensions, direction and intensity. If we ask persons to tell us whether an occupant of some position should engage in a specified activity, some may reply that he should and others that he should not. In addition, some individuals who feel he should perform the behavior may say he absolutely must while others may feel he preferably should. In short, negative and positive expectations can be distinguished according to their degree of mandatoriness.

Role and Role Definers. To this point we have defined the concepts

of position and expectation. Our definition of role is based on these two concepts: a role is a set of expectations, or in terms of our definition of expectations, a set of evaluative standards applied to an incumbent of a particular position. This definition places no restrictions on who is a definer of expectations. A role definer may be the incumbent of a particular position, an occupant of a position in its role network, or any individual an investigator specifies. In the case of the principalship we can speak of the role definitions of its incumbents (principals), those of incumbents of counter positions (for example, teachers, students, higher administrators), or individuals not involved directly in the principal's network (for example, professors of educational administration, and formal leaders of community or governmental agencies).

In addition, our formulation contains no assumption that there is consensus among role definers.⁸ These aspects of our conceptualization are important for our analyses because they allow us to study the principalship with reference to the role definitions held by principals, themselves, their superordinates, and their subordinates.

Role Behavior and Patterns of Role Behavior. As already noted, we need concepts to distinguish the expectations held for a position incumbent from his performance in that capacity. We define a single action of an incumbent with reference to an expectation for it as role behavior. We designate a set of such actions as a role behavior pattern.

Organizational Analysis

In this section we discuss concepts for characterizing the social setting in which the principalship is located: the school system, and

more immediately, the school. A school can be classified as one type of social system: a large-scale organization. We are concerned with some of its distinguishing characteristics as they pertain to this study.

The principalship may be viewed as a position in two organizational settings, the school and the school system; we are most directly concerned with the school and treat the system as one segment of its external environment.⁹ We turn, then, to some of the properties of large-scale organizations of special relevance to the principalship and the school.

Goals. Organizations are explicitly oriented to the accomplishment of goals. A goal is a statement about purpose that defines where the resources -- financial, personal, and material -- of the organization should be committed. It can be specific and short-range, as in the case of a factory producing nuts and bolts, or intangible and long-range, as in the case of schools dedicated to the education of children. A single organization can have several goals that may be more or less consistent; two organizations may have ostensibly the same goal, but in their particular contexts, the goal may have different implications for organizational operation. Moreover, organizations can be distinguished according to their goals. In the case of a school, we assume that the intent of principals is to contribute to their realization.

Positions and their arrangements. Although we have already used the concept of position in the context of role analysis, it is also germane to this discussion. An organization, we contend, can be viewed as a set of positions -- offices, posts, jobs, and slots are commonly used terms equivalent to position -- arranged in different ways depending on

the nature of the organization. One type of arrangement is hierarchy: a ranking of positions according to some criterion (e.g., the right of occupants to give orders). Other arrangements are based on criteria such as the division of labor (e.g., those of teacher and guidance counselor). For our purposes, the concept of position is especially useful in that it provides a linkage between role analysis and organizational analysis; the concept is common to both.

Individuals as organization members. We have made a distinction between a position and its occupant(s). On the one hand, positions are occupied by individuals having unique personalities and characteristics that may or may not be shared (e.g., age, socio-economic status, etc.). On the other hand, they are assigned a position in an organization to contribute to its operation. That is to say, the organization -- if we can anthropomorphize for the moment -- wants and pays for the contribution, but the whole man must be admitted to membership in order to get it.

In the analysis of organizations in sociological terms, it is necessary to make some conceptual provision for the individual in other than purely psychological terms.¹⁰ The concept of position is useful in that an investigator can take account of (1) those aspects of role behavior attributable to organizational forces (e.g., the expectations and sanctions of superiors); (2) those aspects of organizational structure that allow for the expression of individuality (e.g., the degree of autonomy accorded a position); and (3) those personality characteristics of an individual, both latent and manifest, that affect the way he acts (i.e., his role behavior).¹¹

Division of Labor. Whether the goals of an organization are tangible or intangible, long- or short-range, it is not possible to understand its actual operation without knowing how goals are specified in terms of the activities that individuals perform. For example, even though high schools and colleges are both dedicated to the education of young persons (that is, have the same goals), the activities of teachers and professors are markedly different. Whatever the tasks happen to be, they are assigned to positions or sets of positions; the occupants of those positions are then expected to engage in them for the collective interest of the organization. In schools different tasks are assigned to principals and teachers; likewise, in colleges different tasks are assigned to deans and professors: administrative and teaching tasks in both cases. Yet, the obvious similarities in teaching and administration in the two settings should not obscure their important differences attributable to a variety of structural differences in these two educational organizations.

Rules and regulations. In an organizational setting, the behavior of individuals is never a matter of indifference. Even where members are given considerable autonomy in the way they act, there are formal rules pertaining to their behavior across various positions, within the same position, and between members and non-members. For example, in school settings, it is generally expected that teachers will attend faculty meetings and that they will meet their classes on schedule. There are other determinants of behavior as well, consistent and inconsistent with the rules; yet one of the facts of organizational life is

that when individuals become members by contracting for the occupancy of a position, they agree to adhere to the prevailing formal rules and regulations.

Ecological setting. There is a variety of organizational characteristics that cannot be readily classified in the categories already discussed; yet these characteristics are important for understanding patterns of role behavior. We consider them to be ecological in the sense that they refer to aspects of the external environment of schools, such as other parts of the school system and the surrounding community.

Any given school is located both in a residential community and in the larger system of schools. In regard to the community, there is an important linkage between the school and its external environment. The social composition of the student body reflects to a considerable extent that of the community the school serves. Since school attendance is mandatory (at least until age 16, in the usual case), the pupil population, considered in the aggregate, is likely to represent both the cohesiveness of and cleavages in the community based upon religion, social class, ethnicity, transiency, and so on; and these aggregate characteristics of the student body may be thought of as part of the school climate.

In regard to the school system, each school represents a single operating unit, geographically isolated from others. The system itself consists of a school board, an administrative echelon whose members are concerned with system operation, and the several schools. The system is an organizational entity in its own right governed according to system-wide standards. Only to a limited extent can these standards apply to

the special problems of each school since schools vary, for example, according to compositions of staff and student body, problems of the district, characteristics of the principal, and school level. By implication, then, one crucial set of problems for principals (as well as for system-wide administrators), is to act in accord with system-wide policies and with reference to the unique situation in each school.

Organizational problems. One main task of this chapter is to develop a conceptual linkage between role analysis and organizational analysis. The first aspect of this linkage is the concept of social position: a category of role (in its global sense) and one of organization as well. A second aspect is that organizations are goal-oriented social systems, and in the process of goal-attainment there are problems of mobilizing internal resources and those of coping with external forces, both of which can affect organizational operation. We contend that these problems are inherent in organizational structure and operation and that they have different manifestations depending on the nature of the organization. We identify their content in general terms in the following paragraphs.

1. Defining goals: deciding whether there shall be one or more goals, long-term as well as short-term; whether new goals should be added or old ones eliminated.

2. Assigning tasks to members: deciding who should do what kind(s) of work; whether complex jobs should be assigned to individuals or whether these jobs should be divided into parts which in turn are assigned to specialists; whether to give new tasks to occupants of

existing positions or to create new positions.

3. Dealing with clients: deciding to be selective or unselective; encouraging or discouraging client participation in the determination of policy; treating clients on a personal or categorical basis; excluding or coopting difficult clients.

4. Supervising personnel: deciding whether to give staff members considerable or little autonomy in performing their tasks; determining the nature of supervisory activities; identifying the circumstances in which supervision should take place; determining the proper balance between the helpful and evaluative aspects of supervision.

5. Coordinating activities: deciding whether to integrate vertically and/or horizontally; to expand by absorbing existing organizational units into a federal structure or by establishing new units by central fiat; differentiating activities geographically or functionally.

6. Effecting change: deciding whether new ideas and procedures should be introduced at all, and if so, from on top or through lower levels in the organizational hierarchy; whether the organization should pioneer or follow the example of others; whether to reward or sanction staff members who innovate; to change only when under pressure or before that time.

We have enumerated six general areas -- there are many others -- in which managerial personnel, among others, must take a stand either deliberately or by default in all organizations.¹²

Implicit in our discussion of the problematic issues in organizational life are the following assumptions: (1) the parts of organizations

are mutually related; (2) changes in one part are associated with changes in others; (3) decisions lead to the commitment of limited resources; (4) resources spent in support of one course of action cannot be used at the same time in support of another; (5) all desirable outcomes cannot be maximized; (6) decisions whose consequences are consistent with the interests of one group of members can be antithetical to those of another; and (7) actions designed to provide a solution to one problem may create additional but unanticipated problems.

Role Segmentation and the Convergence of Role and Organizational Analysis

Until now we have introduced a set of concepts drawn from two lines of sociological inquiry -- role analysis and organizational analysis -- that typically have been treated separately. One of the basic problems in this study was to formulate a scheme useful for analyzing role behavior in terms of its implications for organizational operation. In this chapter we make our strategy explicit by dealing with a conceptual issue that has been called "role segmentation."¹³

This issue is one that has perplexed both sociologists and social psychologists in their efforts to study many problems of their disciplines; for example, the relationship of social structure and personality to the behavior of individuals. As Inkeles observes:

As this task is pursued [the study of the impact of social structure and personality as independent but interacting variables influencing the flow of the social process] sociologists

will increasingly discover how impoverished and inadequate is their conceptual scheme in the very area in which they feel so secure. Although sociologists give a central place in their conceptual scheme to the role concept, it is surprising to discover how undeveloped this area of study is. There is, for example, no standard set of concepts or categories which could be used to describe any typical role or set of roles in a way that is sociologically meaningful, does some justice to its complexity, and permits systematic comparison with other roles. The devising of such a set of categories, particularly one which will have meaning with reference to personality variables, is a necessary precondition for launching the program of fruitful research which invites our attention here.¹⁴

Role segmentation constitutes a central analytic problem in studies concerned with the linkages among expectations, role performance, and the structural properties of organizations. To illustrate: in studies such as ours that focus on the way individuals who manage organizations affect productivity and morale, what set of general sociological categories can be used to conceptualize role expectations and performance and at the same time take the structural characteristics of the organizational setting into account? The literature is silent on this issue, and previous role analyses in organizational contexts have dealt with the question essentially on an ad hoc basis.¹⁵

Gross, Mason, and McEachern, in one attempt to combine both role and organizational analysis, deduced a series of propositions about

consensus and role definition based on a set of assumptions about formal organizations.¹⁶ These assumptions were designed to apply generally to all types of organizations. Among their propositions were some applying to the relationships between subordinates and superordinates. While it is probably true that all subordinate-superordinate relationships have certain common characteristics, it is also likely that they vary. As we shall see later in this chapter, there are differences, for example, between the principal-teacher relationship and the teacher-pupil relationship, related to structural properties of schools.

In developing our scheme, we begin with an idea considered earlier in the chapter: every organization must come to terms with a set of problems inherent in its operation. Our approach to the role segmentation problem rests on the premise that role behavior can be conceptualized in terms of these problems. That is to say, one of the central responsibilities of those holding executive positions is to cope with these problems. More specifically, principals, as occupants in such positions in school settings, can adopt alternative courses of action in dealing with them.

We make no assumption that the problems will be automatically recognized, nor that any course(s) of action will constitute a contribution to the equilibrium or stability of an organization. We do contend, however, that actions -- role behavior -- pertaining to these problems will have important organizational consequences and can be interpreted as aspects of organizational operation.

Since we have conceptualized role behavior as a category of

organizational operation, this does not mean that normative pressures as represented through expectations do not have an important place in our formulation. Quite the contrary. We assume that expectations operate as one of the major determinants of role behavior, as manifested both in the expectations of others for an individual and in his own orientation toward or conception of the way he ought to act.

Earlier in this chapter we discussed organizations in terms of the content of their inherent problems. For these problems decisions must be made and in regard to each of them there are alternative courses of action.

Our strategy in using role analysis to study the performance of school principals is to examine their patterns of role behavior with respect to these problems as they are manifest in schools, and we shall focus on three of them: (1) supervision of members' performance, (2) support of innovation, and (3) the involvement of clients in organizational affairs. We shall inquire about circumstances that may account for the organizational effects of varying response patterns to these three problems and about conditions under which principals conform to their own conceptions of how they should act in coping with them.

The Principalship in Organizational Perspective

We turn now to a consideration of the principalship in its organizational setting. The principalship is located in a network of positions within the school, the school system, and the community. The network can be represented pictorially as a table of organization. A table is

useful in that it identifies the positions -- particularly those within a school system -- most relevant to the principal's work; however, a table may be misleading in so far as it ignores certain positions and misrepresents others.

School Board and Superintendent

Although the principal is formally subordinate to both the school board and the superintendent, the importance of these superiors for his work is very different. Like the principal, the superintendent is an educational administrator; both are technical experts on educational matters even though they differ in location within the system hierarchy. Board members, in contrast, are selected for office by election or appointment, and there is no guarantee that they will have expertness in educational matters.

In school systems, the school board is placed diagrammatically at the top of the hierarchy; subordinate to it are the offices of superintendent and principal. This arrangement of positions is based on the assumption that relationships of subordination and superordination are based on the rights to hire and fire, give orders, and expect compliance. However, even though school boards possess these rights through law, superintendents and principals are trained as professional educators. Board members are not; they are laymen. If tables of organization were designed to reflect hierarchies based on technical competence, the arrangement of the two top positions would be reversed.

As far as principals are concerned, their actions are potentially subject to two kinds of review, at least over those actions that pertain

directly to system-wide policies. What a principal can accomplish depends to some extent on the relationship existing between the superintendent and the school board whose claim to authority is based on sharply contrasting criteria.

Higher Administrators and Principals

It would be overly simple to consider system-wide administrators -- those based in the central office of a school system and superordinate to principals -- as superiors who relay general policies down the line. Although principals are located lower in the hierarchy, they do not merely take orders from above; rather, they must interpret system-wide policies in the context of a variety of conditions and problems unique to their own schools and not necessarily recognized or understood by their superiors. This characteristic of the principalship is based on the fact that individual schools are geographically dispersed and that they are differentiated according to level. A principal, in short, occupies a position that brings him into contact with some people whose perspectives represent in part system-wide interests and problems and others whose perspectives derive in part from problems internal to the school and from the specific district served.

With respect to opportunities and resources in many organizations, a member's tasks are defined according to directives reflecting organizational policy imposed by an immediate administrative superior. One of a subordinate's obligations in many organizations is to do what he is told in the prescribed way. In other organizations, members are given considerable discretion in what they should do and how they should do it.

In other words, positions differ in the degree of autonomy associated with them; they also differ according to the degree of access to resources their occupants are granted or can gain for themselves, whether these resources take the form of adequate budget, personnel, material resources, or the responsibility to recruit, hire, and fire subordinates.

In school systems higher administrators have a great deal to say about how much discretion a principal will have and about how much access he will have to resources available within the school system. The actions of higher administrators can, in short, affect the work of principals in very fundamental ways.

There is at least one other respect in which higher administrators directly influence the work of principals: career advancement. To take the usual route to advancement within public school systems, the principal must leave the school as a workplace and seek a position in the higher, or system-wide, administration. Upward mobility, however, depends in large measure on the judgment, encouragement, and sponsorship of administrative superiors since the latter are the only persons who can both observe -- not necessarily accurately -- the principal's activities and legitimately judge his capacity and promise for a higher administrative post.

Principals and Teachers

The principal is higher in the school hierarchy than his teachers. They, like the principal, are employees hired by the school board and hold contractual agreements with it but work directly under the principal. The actual processes of recruiting and hiring teachers, however, may devolve on any one of a number of administrators, but not necessarily

the principal; there are variations in these processes both within and among systems. The principal, therefore, to a large extent depends on the cooperation of subordinates whom, in the typical case, he has had little say in selecting.

Unlike certain other groups of salaried workers (e.g., clerical personnel in business firms), teachers are professionalized to the extent that they are, for the most part and increasingly, college graduates and have received supervised training in the techniques of teaching and in the subjects taught. Relatively prolonged technical training is required for employment, and in recognition of this, teachers are generally given opportunities to exercise independent judgment over a considerable range of decisions necessary to run a classroom. Yet a principal has formal responsibility (derived from his accountability to the system-wide administration) for supervising teachers who face unique classroom problems and who differ among themselves over a wide range of personal characteristics. His decision to act, then, must take into account the professionalized nature of his staff, the unique characteristics of each classroom situation, and the variations in the social and psychological characteristics of faculty members.

Teachers and Pupils

The position of the teacher is analogous to that of the principal in the sense that occupants of both positions have obligations to immediate superiors for carrying out school-wide and system-wide policies. In addition, teachers and principals serve individuals whose interests differ at a number of points from those of their superiors.

In another respect, however, the analogy is misleading. The statement that a principal is to his teachers as a teacher is to his pupils is not wholly tenable because pupils and teachers are not affiliated with schools in the same way. The teacher is a hired employee, and at least in the short run, the contract of employment signifies both the teacher's desire to join the organization and his willingness to contribute his services and follow the lines of school and system policies.

The situation of the pupil differs markedly. He is not a hired employee but a client, a conscripted but not necessarily an involuntary one. Particularly at the elementary school level, the decision to be a pupil is not his own since he must attend according to the law. Clearly, his "decision" to be a member of the school organization is not identical with the decision of teachers to participate in school activities. Although many young children want to go to school and accept its regimen, one of the fundamental tasks of the elementary school is to create in the child a positive desire to attend, to do the work, and most importantly, to accept the rules of the game governing the process of schooling.

The analogy breaks down at another point as well. If we grant the fact that there is a component of authority in both the principal-teacher and teacher-pupil relationships, there is, nevertheless, an important distinction between the two. The principalship affords its occupant considerable opportunity to deal with teachers on a one-to-one basis when the situation calls for supervision, criticism, assistance, support, punitive action, and so forth. In this respect, the principalship shares

an important characteristic with independent free-taking professions whose members can deal with their client-subordinates one at a time and with due regard for the uniqueness of cases.

The teacher does not share this good fortune. His task is complicated by the fact that he must cope both with a class (and most of his time is spent in the classroom), an aggregation of pupils as a social unit, and with these same pupils individually. The injunction that a teacher be fair in his treatment of pupils, especially when he must exercise discipline, may prevent him from taking divergent courses of public action if he believes that several pupils may pose the same problem for him but for dissimilar reasons, and that their interests will be better served if they are treated differently.

In addition to the question of fairness, the teacher's job requires that he maintain order and exercise control over an aggregate of individuals. Order requires at least a modicum of voluntary cooperation by all or most all the participants; it takes but one refractory individual to produce chaos. In this respect, the teacher's job has similarities to that of the policeman in a crowd, the guard in a prison mess hall, and the clergyman exhorting his congregation. In all these cases, the resources available to subordinates for disobeying are far more potent than those held by superiors for preserving order or imparting their message. The teacher, in effect, depends heavily on the willingness of pupils to honor his requests, do the work he assigns, and learn what is expected.

The work of the principal, then, is influenced by the fact that his organization contains two categories of subordinates, teachers and pupils,

who are affiliated with the school in very different ways, as employees and clients respectively, whose interests are often far from identical.

Principal and Community

A principal has contact with members of the community (usually the school district), indirectly through the decisions of a lay school board and directly through contact with the parents of children attending his school.¹⁷

The classroom, like the school board, constitutes an important junction between the school and the community. The connection, however, is not one between the school system and the wider community (including its organized interest groups), but one between the teacher and individual family units. The confrontation of school and community at the classroom level is understandable in terms of the fact that in industrial societies schooling is a process for developing cognitive and social skills and for establishing norms governing behavior more appropriate in the occupational world than in life among kinsmen. The competence of the family is limited in these areas.

Although the classroom constitutes a direct linkage between school and community, problems arising out of the often conflicting interests of teachers, pupils, and parents become the concern of principals who serve as the organizational representatives of their schools.

School Level

As we have noted, the nature of the principal's work is influenced by the characteristics of other positions in the network of which his own is a part. His role behavior, therefore, may vary with differences in organizational structure related to school level: elementary, junior high, and senior high schools.

High schools, and to a lesser extent junior highs, contain more administrative positions between the principalship and teaching positions -- assistant principals and department heads being the most obvious examples -- than do elementary schools. In addition, the more "clinical psychological" functions that elementary teachers usually perform as part of their teaching duties form the core of specialized guidance services that are organizationally distinct from teaching at the secondary levels. The secondary principal, therefore, must take into account the distinct interests of his staff members who occupy administrative and staff positions not usually found at the elementary level.

In addition, high schools on the average are larger than junior highs which in turn are larger than elementary schools. There is, however, considerable overlap in size, a fact that emphasizes the analytical distinction between size and complexity. An elementary school, that is, can be much larger than a high school but be less complex organizationally.

Schools also differ according to the activities assigned to faculty members. In the elementary schools, each faculty member usually teaches almost the whole curriculum for any given grade; individual teachers are

generalists in the sense that they are held responsible for performing a diversity of complex tasks. In the secondary schools, especially at the high school level, teachers tend to be specialists in that they tend to concentrate on particular subject matter areas.

Because teachers differ in their degree of specialization according to school level, the problems of principals may be different. In the high schools, for example, principals cannot be competent in all subjects and their associated methods of instruction; by implication, because they are responsible for the overall operation of the school, they may adopt different strategies for supervision: delegating the job to someone else, failing to do it altogether, supervising only those teachers whose competence he shares, etc.

Schools at the three levels also differ in the social composition of their teaching and administrative staffs. Elementary school teachers are overwhelmingly women; principals are more evenly divided according to sex. In the secondary schools, teachers are more evenly divided by sex, and principals are overwhelmingly men. There are also differences in age composition of both faculty and principals according to school level that can be particularly problematic at the elementary level where there is relatively the greatest likelihood that a young, inexperienced male principal will hold an administrative position higher than older, experienced female teachers. At any rate, when one considers the social composition of schools in terms of a variety of personal characteristics of teachers and principals, there is a variety of possible status anomalies between principals and teachers based primarily on sex, length of

experience, and pattern of career development.

Schools at different levels vary according to the homogeneity of the residential communities they serve: the higher the school level, the greater the heterogeneity of pupil composition. This fact suggests that high school principals must direct a variety of instructional programs suitable to a diversified student body. It also suggests that principals will have different problems in dealing with parents depending on whether parents have easy access to the school (as in the case of the neighborhood elementary school). In addition, principals have to deal with parents about different educational issues because school level is also related to the developmental stages of children; the college preparatory curriculum decision, made formally at the close of the junior high school years, being a case in point.

Although we have not exhausted all organizational variations associated with school level, we have tried to describe enough of the differences and their implications to suggest that the principal's job varies at each level -- which is not to say that there are no similarities as well.

Role Performance: Effects and Determinants

Our basic concern in this chapter has been to conceptualize role behavior. In previous formulations of the concept -- in fact of the whole cluster of concepts usually subsumed under the concept of role -- investigators have usually (though not always) attributed role behavior to external social forces impinging on an individual by virtue of his

occupying a position. Useful as this formulation has been, writers have not extended its relevance to a sufficiently broad spectrum of problems. Three limitations in the existing literature are most conspicuous: (1) adequate treatment of the impact of role behavior on organizational operation; (2) adequate treatment of the social settings in which role behavior takes place; and (3) the substantive content of role behavior -- the problem of role segmentation.

It is most common to find role behavior treated as a dependent variable: the resultant of forces impinging on an individual because he occupies a particular social position. Gross, Mason, and McEachern, for example, state that: "A role behavior is an actual performance of an incumbent of a position which can be referred to an expectation for an incumbent of that position."¹⁸ There is no reason to question the utility of this formulation since there is ample evidence from many studies that role behavior can indeed be attributed to expectations, though not exclusively.

It is a basic premise of our study that role behavior can also be conceived as an independent variable, that individuals do affect both organizational operation and structure through their role behavior. Even though sociologists have conducted few investigations based on this premise, executives and boards of directors in many kinds of organizations have been acutely aware of its importance as illustrated by the fact that they spend so much time, thought, and energy recruiting individuals to fill high level and sensitive positions. If organizational forces of a normative or coercive nature were sufficiently potent to

guarantee that individuals would act in the prescribed ways, recruitment would be a routine matter.¹⁹ There is, of course, a considerable literature on the effects of leadership and supervision on morale and productivity; these investigations, however, are ad hoc in the sense that they are not based on any general set of ideas for coping with the conceptual issues involved in formulating the relationship(s) of individuals to organizations. This is not to say that leadership, supervision, and their effects are not important to study in their own right; but when the literature becomes clogged with inconsistent and ambiguous findings, this fact is a good sign that the conceptual issues have yet to be defined in general conceptual terms and that an attempt at codification is in order.

In many studies employing role analysis, there is little or no conceptualization of the settings in which role behavior takes place. In the present investigation, we have tried to set forth some of the characteristic structural properties of schools and variations in them. Several of these properties are particularly salient: (1) American public schools are locally managed, and this constitutes an expression of a dominant ideological theme that schools should be responsive to community needs and that those who, in a very immediate sense, pay for the costs of school operation -- members of the community -- should have something to say about school operation.

(2) Schools are organizations that fall within the general category of professional bureaucracies in that teachers have professionalized training with all that implies for the relatively untrammelled use of judgment in situations falling within the area of their competence, yet

at the same time have obligations to administrative superiors who by virtue of their hierarchical position also have the right to make decisions falling within the professional competence of teachers.

(3) Schools, along with colleges and mental hospitals, exemplify one type of organization that takes its clients -- pupils, in this case -- in as members, and conscripted members at that.

(4) Schools differ in organizational structure according to level: elementary, junior, and senior high. Although they are all schools, they vary in organizational complexity, size, specialization of teaching activities, heterogeneity of the social composition of the district served.

(5) Schools also differ by level in terms of the social composition of faculty: elementary schools are overwhelmingly staffed by women teachers, and the proportion of men is larger both at the junior and senior high levels with slightly over half the high school teachers being men. The sex distribution of teachers is an especially important property of schools because teaching is a relatively underpaid occupation, and the possibilities of advancement within teaching (as distinct from education) are poor; advancement into administration requires the abandonment of a teaching career. Men tend to move out of teaching into administration -- there cannot possibly be enough administrative posts to absorb all potential recruits -- or out of the educational profession altogether. In regard to the principalship, secondary school positions are overwhelmingly staffed by men, the sex ratio being more balanced at the elementary level.

In describing these structural characteristics of schools, we have

attempted to identify some of the most salient properties constituting the organizational context in which principals work. It is the particular nature of these conditions that in various ways, we assume, affect the principals' decisions to take one course of action or another.

Finally, we have concerned ourselves with the substantive content of role behavior, the problem of role segmentation. There is ample evidence indicating that the behavior of persons occupying social positions can be attributed, at least in part, to expectations applied to the position. But what expectations? We are dealing with one particular type of organization (and variations in that type), and we contend that role behavior can be conceptualized in terms of problems confronting organizations in general and of the particular manifestations of those problems that confront organizations of a particular type, in this case schools. Out of a vast range of potential problem areas -- and there seems to be no justification at this stage of our knowledge to put a clear limit on the number of existing problems -- we have concerned ourselves with three on the grounds that they apply generally to a wide range of organizations and are particularly important in the context of schools: closeness of supervision, support of innovation, and client involvement.

In general, then, we maintain that individuals, considered as occupants of organizational positions (principals in this investigation) can have an impact on how organizations operate and that the extent of that impact will depend on the structural properties of the organization in question. In addition, we contend that patterns of role behavior can vary according to the normative demands applied to occupants of positions --

including those demands that are self-imposed -- and that the impact of these demands upon role behavior depend in part on the properties of the social setting.

Notes and References for Chapter Two

1. Neal Gross, Ward S. Mason, and Alexander W. McEachern, Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendency Role (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1958), Chapter IV.

2. Ibid., Chapter III.

3. Ibid., p. 17.

4. Ibid., pp. 48-58.

5. Ibid., p. 51.

6. Ibid., p. 53.

7. Ibid., pp. 50-58.

8. Ibid., Chapter III.

9. Logically speaking, we could make the school system itself the central focus; each school would then represent one part of the system. Since the principalship is our main concern, and the principal's behavior is most directly relevant to the operation of the school rather than to the larger system, our discussion of organizational setting primarily concerns the school.

10. We are not saying that psychological characteristics are irrelevant to organizational analysis. On the contrary, we contend that a sociological formulation must take into account conceptually the fact that individuals do bring personal characteristics, skills, and styles of acting with them into the organization.

11. See, for example, Alvin W. Gouldner, "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles - I, II," Administrative Science Quarterly, II (1957-1958), pp. 281-306, 444-480; Richard E. Neustadt,

Presidential Power (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1960); Doris C. Gilbert and Daniel J. Levinson, "Role Performance, Ideology, and Personality in Mental Hospital Aides," in Milton Greenblatt, Daniel J. Levinson, and Richard H. Williams (Editors), The Patient and the Mental Hospital (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957), pp. 197-208; and Chester I. Barnard, The Functions of the Executive (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1936), pp. 16-17 and passim.

12. For a consideration of other problem areas with which managerial personnel must deal, see Herbert A. Simon, Donald W. Smithburg, and Victor A. Thompson, Public Administration (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1950).

13. Gross, Mason and McEachern, op. cit., pp. 61-64.

14. Alex Inkeles, "Personality and Social Structure," in Robert K. Merton, Leonard Broom, and Leonard S. Cottrell (Editors), Sociology Today (New York: Basic Books, 1959), p. 267.

15. See, for example, Rensis Likert, New Patterns of Management (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc. 1961); Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, Formal Organizations (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1962).

16. Gross, Mason, and McEachern, op. cit., pp. 122-143.

17. He must also deal with representatives of various organized community groups, with and without axes to grind.

18. Gross, Mason, and McEachern, op. cit., p. 64.

19. For an important discussion of the impact of individual action on organizational life, see Philip Selznick, Leadership in Administration (Evanston: Row, Peterson and Co., 1957), pp. 29-64, with reference to

the distinction between critical and routine decisions; and Heustadt,

loc. cit.

Chapter 3: Research Methods

In this chapter we describe the methods used to obtain and analyze the data examined in our inquiry. They were secured as part of a larger research program, the National Principalship Study, and hence a number of methodological issues were resolved in a manner most compatible with the several objectives of the entire Study. We shall therefore initially describe those activities and decisions bearing on both our investigation and the others. We shall present in considerable detail the procedures we used in measuring the patterns of role expectations for principals and their role performance on the following dimensions: closeness of supervision, support of innovation, and parent involvement in school affairs.¹

Preliminary Activities

During the planning phase of the Study, staff members reviewed the educational literature on the principalship and the social science literature on the analysis of roles and large-scale organizations. They discussed basic theoretical and methodological questions, including the main topics to be investigated, problems of design, and limitations of scope (e.g., the decision to study only non-teaching principals in large cities).

Staff members engaged in a number of other preliminary activities before settling on the final design. One member joined a two-week summer workshop for elementary school principals at Boston University, and as a participant-observer explored new methods for measuring concepts such as role orientation, behavior, and role conflict. Students in a

graduate seminar at Harvard University developed and pre-tested a variety of questionnaires and interview schedules on a sample of 75 principals in the Boston area. In addition, the staff invited several graduate students and educational administrators on leave to discuss problems of the principalship and to evaluate our preliminary ideas and research instruments.

Having formulated the problems and the scope of the Study, staff members turned to the design of research instruments. When the schedules and questionnaires were completed, we pre-tested them on eight principals from the Boston and New York areas whom we invited to Cambridge. They spent a full day answering our questions and gave us their critical reactions as to their relevance, clarity, adequacy of their coverage, and important omissions.

These pre-test interviews served as a trial run for staff members who later carried out the field-work activities. They also led to the reexamination and revision of our procedures for collecting data. The results of the pre-test interviews indicated that different methods of asking questions would be needed to obtain different types of data. More specifically, we found that data we had planned to obtain from the principals' responses to questionnaires could best be obtained in personal interviews while other information could most efficiently be gathered through a questionnaire administered to principals in groups. Other data, we discovered, could be best obtained by means of a mailed questionnaire, for example, factual information about characteristics of the principals' teachers and students and their career histories, data

that required the principals to have access to their school and personal files.

Population and Sample

The target population for the Study consisted of all supervising principals in cities with populations of 50,000 or more during the 1960-1961 school year. One reason for limiting the sample to large cities was to exclude principals with teaching responsibilities. Since we had no accurate way of identifying them individually prior to the field work, we restricted our population to large cities because teaching principals are found primarily in small communities. A second reason was our interest in studying problems confronting principals in large urban centers.

In selecting the sample of principals, we used the latest information available.² We first stratified the 10,956 principalships in all cities in the continental United States with 50,000 or more inhabitants by geographical region, per-pupil expenditure, and by population. Through the use of a cluster sampling procedure, we wanted to obtain approximately 500 principals who represent a 5 per cent sample of the population of principals in 41 cities.

The second phase of the sampling procedure required a random selection of principals in each of the 41 school systems. To make this selection, we classified schools in each of the systems according to level (elementary, junior high, and senior high), and according to the predominant socio-economic composition of their student bodies (high, middle, or low) as estimated by the superintendent. Our intent in doing this was to obtain a sample of schools that varied both as to level and

socio-economic composition. We eliminated from the Study all teaching principals--there are only a few in large cities--and those those in charge of more than one school. The final number of principals in our sample was 506.

Data Collection

The design of the Study required collecting data from principals, their teachers, and their immediate administrative superiors. We gathered information from principals in three phases. In the first, we notified each principal by personal letter of his selection in the sample, explained the purposes of the Study, and requested that he complete a lengthy questionnaire about his personal characteristics (e.g., age, sex, marital status), family background (e.g., father's occupation, community of origin), his job history, and his school (e.g., number of pupils, characteristics of the faculty). We guaranteed that all information he supplied would be treated with complete confidentiality and that he and his school would remain anonymous. We requested that he bring the completed questionnaire to a luncheon meeting to be held at a later date with the other principals in his city participating in the Study.

During the fall of 1960 members of the staff visited each of the 41 cities and began the second phase of data collection from the principals. As a rule, the staff arrived on a Sunday evening and set up headquarters at a downtown hotel. On Monday morning, a senior staff member contacted the superintendent of schools or his representative, reviewed with him the activities that had earlier been planned and agreed upon for the week, and answered any questions.

A luncheon for the superintendent, members of his administrative staff, and the participating principals was usually given on Monday. At that time we explained the nature of the Study in full detail, again guaranteed the confidentiality of information, and answered questions. Following the luncheon, the superintendent and his aides left the meeting by prior agreement, and the principals remained as long as necessary to complete the Role Questionnaire--roughly three hours, on the average, and ranging from about two to five hours.

The questionnaire contained 10 precoded sections and covered such areas as: the principal's attitudes and values, conception of his job, sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction in his work, and so on. In addition, each principal was asked to serve as an observer of his administrative superiors and teachers by describing certain of their work activities, especially those that could potentially affect his own job. Staff members remained with the principals after the luncheon to answer questions as they arose while the principals completed the questionnaire.

The third phase of data collection from the principals took place later in the week when we interviewed each principal for roughly three hours. The interviews were conducted in a local hotel so that the principals could answer our questions in a setting free from the interruptions they encounter in their offices. The first part of the interview was designed to give the principal an opportunity to discuss and raise questions about the earlier phases of the Study; to qualify, explain, and if necessary to correct earlier responses to precoded questions; and to speak at length about issues that he viewed as crucially important in

his particular school. This procedure was followed not only to learn about the unique problems and characteristics of his own school and system as the principal perceived them but also to free him from the constraints he might feel after completing a precoded questionnaire designed for a national sample but unavoidably inappropriate in certain particulars about his own situation.

The interview schedule contained questions about the principals' strengths and weaknesses, reasons for seeking the job, obstacles in the work, and so on. The total time the principals expended on providing us with data during the three phases averaged approximately twelve hours. Of the 508 principals in our sample, 501 were involved in all three phases of the Study.

The design also called for the collection of data from the immediate superiors of all principals. To gather information from this group of administrators working out of the central office of the system, we arranged a Friday noon luncheon for the superintendent and members of his staff. At this time we reviewed the nature of the project, the course of the week's events, and answered questions. Again, we guaranteed the confidentiality of the information to be provided and then asked these administrators to complete questionnaires similar in many respects to those completed by the principals. Of the 172 system-wide administrators attending these luncheons and completing the questionnaires (superintendents, their deputies and assistants, and a variety of staff specialists), 128 were identified by the principals as their immediate superiors and this group comprises the sample of higher administrators.

Teachers in the 501 schools constituted the third source of data. Near the end of each principal's interview, we asked whether he would be willing to let us draw a sample of teachers from his school to answer a set of questions like the ones we asked him; 491 out of 501 (98 per cent) agreed to this request (as did 40 of the 41 superintendents).

In April 1961 following a preliminary analysis of the principal data, we sent a 21-page questionnaire to 10 teachers selected randomly from each of the 476 schools in which we had obtained permission to secure data from teachers. They were asked to provide background information about themselves and to complete a questionnaire concerned with their definition of the principal's role, of their own role, and to supply us with observations about their principal's school-related activities. We also asked them about their satisfaction with work and career, and to describe characteristics of the school, their colleagues, and to give us information about pupils and their parents.

To obtain the largest possible return, we sent follow-up letters to all teachers who had not returned questionnaires at the end of two weeks and again at the end of four. Of the 4,760 questionnaires mailed out, we received 3,367 usable returns (71 per cent). This latter number constituted the teacher sample.

Data Processing and Summarization

Four of the five basic research instruments mentioned in the previous section were precoded: the Principal's Background Questionnaire, his Role Questionnaire, the Higher Administrator's Questionnaire, and the Teacher Questionnaire. The fifth, the Personal Interview with the

principals, being largely open-ended, required special coding. The pre-coded material was designed so that responses could be punched into IBM cards directly from the protocols after editing (to take account of ambiguities, double responses, marginal comments, etc.). Unclear answers were coded "blank." All precoded data were punched and verified (re-punched) by professional machine operators.

The bulk of the data processing was carried out on IBM computers. We used this equipment primarily to develop indices of concepts based on the summarization of responses to question items. For example, we asked principals how satisfied they were with various aspects of their careers; they responded by checking one of six alternatives ranging from "very satisfied" to "very dissatisfied" for each of 18 questions designed to measure career satisfaction. We might have compared various categories of principals (men and women, for example) on each of the questions; but considering the large number of questions asked (over 1,000 in the whole Study), summarizing and presenting the data item-by-item would have been inefficient and extremely cumbersome. Instead, we tried to develop summary measures containing several items to represent indices of concepts and to use these indices as single variables for analysis.

In developing indices of concepts, we usually first tried Guttman scale criteria; whenever we failed to meet them, we used factor-analytic summaries. Either way, we were able to assign weights to the items comprising the summary, a procedure we judged as better than using an additive criterion in which all items are assigned equal weight. In using factor analysis, a principal components analysis was performed. If the

resulting factors could be interpreted with clear sociological or psychological meaning, the loadings of the items on the factor were used as weights in computing factor scores (based on weight and actual question response) for each principal for the concept in question. However, if the factor had no clear theoretical meaning, the factor loadings were rotated orthogonally using the Varimax criterion developed by Kaiser.³ The new loadings were then converted to factor coefficients using the "shortened method" suggested by Harman.⁴ These coefficients were then used as weights for computing factor scores for variables used in our analyses.

The Measurement of Patterns of Role Expectations and Role Performance

Two basic measurement problems confronted us in carrying out our investigation. The first was the development of summary measures of principals' self-expectations with respect to the supervision of teachers, support of innovation, and parental participation. We also needed summary measures of expectations that higher administrators and teachers held for principals in these three areas. The second problem centered on obtaining summary measures of the principals' role performance. We now present the procedures we used in developing measures of these variables: patterns of expectations and behavior based on summarized responses.

Patterns of Role Expectations for the Performance of Principals

In completing the Role Questionnaire, each of the 501 principals was asked with respect to 97 role expectation items, "What obligation do you feel as principal of your school to [engage in] the following activities?" The response categories for each item were:

- A. Absolutely must
- B. Preferably should
- C. May or may not
- D. Preferably should not
- E. Absolutely must not

For the purposes of this inquiry, our primary interest is in their replies to those items from which we could extract summary measures of the principals' self-expectations with respect to three dimensions of their performance: closeness of their supervision, support of innovation, and involvement of parents in school affairs. We first computed a Pearsonian product-moment correlation matrix of responses to each of the three sets of self-expectation items tapping the dimensions noted above.⁵ An examination of the three matrices revealed that the principals' responses were highly interrelated and that as anticipated summary measures of the three dimensions of the principals' self-expectations could be obtained. Therefore, a principal components factor analysis was performed on each of the three matrices.

The items used in our three summary measures of principals' self-expectations were obtained from the first factor of the principal components solution. We selected those items with highest weights on the

factor, accepted no items with loadings below 0.35 on the factor nor with a difference between its loading on the first factor and that on another that was less than 0.10. We then computed factor scores for each principal on each of the three dimensions of self-expectations based on item responses and their respective factor weights. The items, their means, their standard deviations, and the weights used in computing the scores for Principal's Self-expectation on Closeness of Supervision are presented in Table 3-1, and the same information about the measures of their Self-expectation on Support of Innovation and Parental Involvement in School Affairs is presented in Tables 3-2 and 3-3, respectively.

The self-expectation scores, then, are based on sets of items all of which have high loadings on a single factor and they have the property of unidimensionality according to factor-analytic criteria. They allow us to differentiate the principals according to the degree they believe they have an obligation to supervise their teachers closely, encourage educational innovation in their schools, and involve parents in school affairs. The distribution of self-expectations scores of the principals for closeness of supervision is presented in Table 3-4, and for support of innovation and parent involvement in school affairs in Tables 3-5 and 3-6, respectively.

We also needed summary measures of the expectations held for the principals' performance by their higher administrators and the teachers in their schools. The items to which the higher administrators and teachers had responded about their role expectations for principals were

Table 3-1. Responses of 501 Principals Describing Their Self-Expectations in the Area of Closeness of Supervision, and Factor Weights Applied to Each Item

Question: What obligation [absolutely must (5), preferably should (4), may or may not (3), preferably should not (2), absolutely must not (1)] do you feel as principal of your school to engage in the following activities?

Item *	N **	Mean	S.D.	Factor Weight
40. Require that teachers discuss their major classroom problems with the principal.	497	3.76	.85	.63
37. Ask teachers to report all major conferences with parents to the principal.	494	3.55	.90	.59
46. Require teachers to keep the principal informed of "problem" children in their classrooms.	494	3.69	.89	.59
39. Closely direct the work of teachers who are likely to experience difficulty.	497	4.24	.72	.50
32. Require that teachers' classroom behavior conform to the principal's standards.	498	3.54	.90	.50
36. Check to see that teachers prepare written lesson plans.	497	3.58	.93	.46
42. Know what is taking place in most classrooms during most of the day.	495	3.72	.82	.39

Table 3-1. (Continued)

Item [*]	N ^{**}	Mean	S.D.	Factor Weight
48. Determine what the objectives of the guidance program should be in the school.	449	4.13	.89	.38

* Items ordered by decreasing magnitude of factor weights.

** These N's are less than 501 because some principals checked the response alternative: "This activity [is] not relevant to my particular situation;" and other omitted the item entirely.

Table 3-2. Responses of 501 Principals Describing Their Self-Expectations in the Area of Support of Innovation, and Factor Weights Applied to Each Item

Question: What obligation [absolutely must (5), preferably should (4), may or may not (3), preferably should not (2), absolutely must not (1)] do you feel as principal of your school to engage in the following activities?

Item*	N**	Mean	S.D.	Factor Weight
21. Encourage the staff to learn about and try out some of the "new ideas" coming from schools of education.	495	3.97	.67	.69
22. Encourage teachers to consider adopting new educational ideas which have been tried out in other other communities and found to be successful.	497	4.10	.66	.67
25. Encourage schools of education to conduct experimental research in the school	437	3.65	.79	.56
19. Attempt to secure teacher in the school who are interested in experimenting with new educational ideas.	442	3.90	.77	.56
29. Seek out new ideas to introduce into the school's program.	494	4.24	.71	.55
17. Give additional free time to teachers who are trying out new ideas in their classes.	471	3.79	.82	.47

* Items ordered by decreasing magnitude of factor weights.

** These N's are less than 501 because some principals checked the response alternative: "This activity [is] not relevant to my particular situation;" and others omitted the item entirely.

Table 3-3. Responses of 501 Principals Describing Their Self-Expectations in the Area of Parental Involvement, and Factor Weights Applied to Each Item

Question: What obligation [absolutely must (5), preferably should (4), may or may not (3), preferably should not (2), absolutely must not (1)] do you feel as principal of your school to engage in the following activities?

Item *	N **	Mean	S.D.	Factor Weight
7. Encourage a group of parents to discuss and help formulate the educational philosophy to be used in the school.	440	3.35	1.01	.61
15. Use interested parents as volunteer part-time "teacher helpers."	409	2.59	1.01	.60
10. Encourage parents to help during school hours on school or class trips or projects.	493	3.67	0.88	.60
3. Use interested parents as an advisory group when making out the course of study.	364	3.35	0.95	.55
12. Encourage interested parent groups to evaluate how well the school is achieving its curricular objectives.	466	3.46	0.97	.48
8. Encourage parental attendance at school assemblies.	488	3.63	0.78	.44

* Items ordered by decreasing magnitude of factor weights.

** These N's are less than 501 because some principals checked the response alternative: "This activity [is] not relevant to my particular situation;" and others omitted the item entirely.

Table 3-4. Distribution of Principals' Factor Scores on Self-Expectations for Closeness of Supervision, for All Cases and by School Level

Factor Scores	All Cases		Elementary		Junior High		Senior High	
	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent
15.00-15.99	4	0.8	1	0.5	2	1.3	1	0.6
14.00-14.99	11	2.2	6	3.2	2	1.3	3	1.9
13.00-13.99	31	6.2	16	8.5	7	4.7	8	5.0
12.00-12.99	63	12.7	35	18.6	23	15.4	5	3.1
11.00-11.99	68	13.7	30	16.0	21	14.1	17	10.6
10.00-10.99	76	15.3	23	12.2	23	15.4	30	18.6
9.00- 9.99	92	18.5	26	13.8	30	20.1	36	22.4
8.00- 8.99	65	13.1	25	13.3	16	10.7	24	14.9
7.00- 7.99	36	7.2	8	4.3	14	9.4	14	8.7
6.00- 6.99	24	4.8	7	3.7	6	4.0	11	6.8
5.00- 5.99	15	3.0	5	2.7	2	1.3	8	5.0
4.00- 4.99	8	1.6	5	2.7	1	0.7	2	1.2
3.00- 3.99	3	0.6	1	0.5	2	1.3	-	-
2.00- 2.99	1	0.2	-	-	-	-	1	0.6
1.00- 1.99	1	0.2	-	-	-	-	1	0.6
Number	498*	100.1	188	100.0	149	99.7	161	100.0
Mean	10.01		10.42		10.14		9.41	
S.D.	2.33		2.37		2.20		2.28	

* Three out of 501 principals answered fewer items than necessary for computing factor scores.

Table 3-5. Distribution of Principals' Factor Scores on Self-Expectations for Support of Innovation, for All Cases and by School Level

Factor Scores	All Cases		Elementary		Junior High		Senior High	
	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent
15.00-15.99	8	1.6	3	1.6	3	2.0	2	1.2
14.00-14.99	22	4.5	10	5.5	4	2.7	8	4.9
13.00-13.99	33	6.7	9	4.9	11	7.4	13	8.0
12.00-12.99	29	5.9	11	6.0	9	6.1	9	5.6
11.00-11.99	52	10.5	19	10.4	11	7.4	22	13.6
10.00-10.99	107	21.7	41	22.4	34	23.0	32	19.8
9.00- 9.99	82	16.6	31	16.9	24	16.2	27	16.7
8.00- 8.99	74	15.0	28	15.3	22	14.9	24	14.8
7.00- 7.99	48	9.7	23	12.6	12	8.1	13	8.0
6.00- 6.99	26	5.3	7	3.8	12	8.1	7	4.3
5.00- 5.99	7	1.4	1	0.6	4	2.7	2	1.2
4.00- 4.99	4	0.8	-	-	2	1.4	2	1.2
3.00- 3.99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.00- 2.99	1	0.2	-	-	-	-	1	0.6
1.00- 1.99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Number	493*	99.9	183	99.9	148	100.0	162	99.9
Mean	10.04		10.10		9.85		10.15	
S.D.	2.24		2.13		2.32		2.30	

* Eight out of 501 principals answered fewer items than necessary for computing factor scores.

Table 3-6. Distribution of Principals' Factor Scores on Self-Expectations for Parental Involvement, for All Cases and by School Level

Factor Scores	All Cases		Elementary		Junior High		Senior High	
	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent
15.00-15.99	1	0.2	1	0.6	-	-	-	-
14.00-14.99	8	1.7	8	4.6	-	-	-	-
13.00-13.99	20	4.3	9	5.2	5	3.7	6	3.8
12.00-12.99	31	6.7	18	10.4	4	3.0	9	5.8
11.00-11.99	90	19.4	37	21.4	20	14.8	33	21.2
10.00-10.99	94	20.3	35	20.2	30	22.2	29	18.6
9.00- 9.99	76	16.4	24	13.9	25	18.5	27	17.3
8.00- 8.99	75	16.2	23	13.3	23	17.0	29	18.6
7.00- 7.99	41	8.8	12	6.9	15	11.1	14	9.0
6.00- 6.99	14	3.0	2	1.2	7	5.2	5	3.2
5.00- 5.99	9	1.9	2	1.2	4	3.0	3	1.9
4.00- 4.99	4	0.9	1	0.6	2	1.5	1	0.6
3.00- 3.99	1	0.2	1	0.6	-	-	-	-
2.00- 2.99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.00- 1.99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Number	464*	100.0	173	100.1	135	100.0	156	100.0
Mean	10.01		10.49		9.56		9.87	
S.D.	1.95		2.04		1.86		1.79	

* Thirty-seven out of 501 principals answered fewer items than necessary for computing factor scores.

identical in content to those to which the principals had replied about their own role obligations. The response categories used by the three sets of role definers were also the same. The question to which the higher administrators responded was, "What obligation do you feel principals under your jurisdiction have to do the following activities?" and the teachers' question was formulated as follows: "Do you feel the principal of your school should engage in the following activities?"

In computing the expectations scores for higher administrators and teachers, we based them on the same items and the same factor weights that we had used in developing the principals' self-expectation scores (see Tables 3-1, 3-2, and 3-3). Through this procedure we insured that the operational definition of the role expectations for the principals' performance of the three sets of role definers was the same.

The Principals' Pattern of Role Performance

Our measure of principals' role performance was based on teacher descriptions of their behavior given by faculty members in their respective schools. The teachers were asked how frequently ("always," "almost always," "occasionally," "almost never," and "never") their principal engaged in the same activities for which they indicated their expectations for his performance. On the basis of items identical in content to those used in constructing the expectation scores, we computed measures of the three dimensions of the principals' performance based on each teacher's responses about their conduct. The procedure was as follows: (1) the same weights used for items in the expectation measures

were applied to the items to which teachers responded in describing the performance of their principal in each area of role behavior (for example, closeness of supervision); (2) the teachers' responses were scored from 5 to 1 (an "always" response was scored 5 and a "never" response was scored 1); (3) three total scores were then computed for each teacher based on his responses to the items referring to his principal's closeness of supervision, support of innovation, and parental involvement in school affairs.⁶

To obtain a best estimate of each principal's behavior on the three dimensions of his role performance, the scores developed from the reports of each of the four to ten teachers in each of the 476 schools were averaged arithmetically. The distribution of these Behavior Scores, their means, and standard deviations, for the three patterns of the principals' role performance for all schools and each school level are presented in Tables 3-7, 3-8, and 3-9.

To obtain a clearer picture of the content of the principals' Behavior Scores, we present a cross-tabulation of their Scores against the teachers' responses on each of the three dimensions of role behavior. For each area of performance, we divided the total range of the principals' scores into six categories and then computed the means and the percentage distributions of teachers' responses to each of the items included in the area for principals in each category. We present these cross-classifications for each of the three areas of role performance in Tables 3-10, 3-11, and 3-12.

In responding to the question, "How frequently does your principal require that teachers' classroom behavior conform to the principal's

standards" (item 32, Table 3-10), 36 per cent of the 547 teachers with principals classified as "highest" on closeness of supervision replied "always" as compared to only 9 per cent of the 507 teachers whose principals were classified as "lowest." In response to question 36 in Table 3-10: "How frequently does your principal check to see that teachers prepare written lesson plans" 31 per cent of the teachers whose principals were highest in closeness of supervision replied "always," while only 2 per cent of these whose principals were categorized as "lowest" did so.

The same pattern of differences between principals scored as relatively high and low in closeness of supervision can be observed through an examination of the teachers' responses to the remaining six of the eight questions summarized in forming the principals' Closeness of Supervision Score. An inspection of Tables 3-11 and 3-12 will reveal similar patterns of differences in the responses of teachers for principals whom we have scored as relatively low and high on support of innovation and parent involvement in school affairs. Technical issues involved in the construction of these scores are considered in Appendix B.

Table 3-7. Distribution of Principals' Behavior Scores on Closeness of Supervision, for All Cases and by School Level

Behavior Scores	All Cases		Elementary		Junior High		Senior High	
	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent
13.00-13.99	1	0.2	1	0.6	-	-	-	-
12.00-12.99	4	0.9	4	2.3	-	-	-	-
11.00-11.99	13	2.9	12	6.9	1	0.7	-	-
10.00-10.99	27	5.9	18	10.3	5	3.7	4	2.8
9.00- 9.99	45	9.9	31	17.7	6	4.4	8	5.6
8.00- 8.99	69	15.2	33	18.9	27	20.0	9	6.2
7.00- 7.99	68	15.0	27	15.4	25	18.5	16	11.1
6.00- 6.99	66	14.5	23	13.1	22	16.3	21	14.6
5.00- 5.99	56	12.3	14	8.0	16	11.9	26	18.1
4.00- 4.99	50	11.0	10	5.7	15	11.1	25	17.4
3.00- 3.99	35	7.7	2	1.1	13	9.6	20	13.9
2.00- 2.99	13	2.9	-	-	2	1.5	11	7.6
1.00- 1.99	6	1.3	-	-	3	2.2	3	2.1
0.00- 0.99	1	0.2	-	-	-	-	1	0.7
Number	454*	99.9	175	99.9	150	100.0	144	100.1
Mean	6.92		8.29		6.57		5.60	
S.D.	2.35		2.00		2.04		2.10	

* In 47 out of 501 schools, teachers provided fewer observations than necessary for computing principal behavior scores.

Table 3-8. Distribution of Principals' Behavior Scores on Support of Innovation, for All Cases and by School Level

Behavior Scores	All Cases		Elementary		Junior High		Senior High	
	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent
13.00-13.99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
12.00-12.99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
11.00-11.99	2	0.4	1	0.6	-	-	1	0.7
10.00-10.99	11	2.4	8	4.6	1	0.7	2	1.4
9.00- 9.99	19	4.2	12	6.9	3	2.2	4	2.8
8.00- 8.99	32	7.0	16	9.1	7	5.2	9	6.3
7.00- 7.99	51	11.2	26	14.9	13	9.6	12	8.3
6.00- 6.99	73	16.1	30	17.1	20	14.8	23	16.0
5.00- 5.99	77	17.0	33	18.9	26	19.3	18	12.5
4.00- 4.99	67	14.8	20	11.4	16	11.9	31	21.5
3.00- 3.99	64	14.1	16	9.1	31	23.0	17	11.8
2.00- 2.99	41	9.0	10	5.7	12	8.9	19	13.2
1.00- 1.99	12	2.6	1	0.6	4	3.0	7	4.9
0.00- 0.99	5	1.1	2	1.1	2	1.5	1	0.7
Number	454*	99.9	175	100.0	135	100.1	144	100.1
Mean	5.54		6.21		5.08		5.15	
S.D.	2.17		2.17		1.98		2.14	

* In 47 out of 501 schools, teachers provided fewer observations than necessary for computing principal behavior scores.

Table 3-9. Distribution of Principals' Behavior Scores on Parental Involvement, for All Cases and by School Level

Behavior Scores	All Cases		Elementary		Junior High		Senior High	
	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent
13.00-13.99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
12.00-12.99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
11.00-11.99	1	0.2	-	-	-	-	1	0.7
10.00-10.99	12	2.6	8	4.6	3	2.2	1	0.7
9.00- 9.99	26	5.7	21	12.0	2	1.5	3	2.1
8.00- 8.99	70	15.5	42	24.0	16	11.9	12	8.4
7.00- 7.99	108	23.8	52	29.7	28	20.7	28	19.6
6.00- 6.99	121	26.7	34	19.4	44	32.6	43	30.1
5.00- 5.99	81	17.9	15	8.6	28	20.7	38	26.6
4.00- 4.99	27	6.0	2	1.1	12	8.9	13	9.1
3.00- 3.99	7	1.5	1	0.6	2	1.5	4	2.8
2.00- 2.99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.00- 1.99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
0.00- 0.99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Number	453*	99.9	175	100.0	135	100.0	143	100.1
Mean	6.98		7.65		6.63		6.49	
S.D.	1.44		1.33		1.32		1.37	

* In 48 out of 501 schools, teachers provided fewer observations than necessary for computing principal behavior scores.

Table 3-10. Distribution (Percentage) of Responses by Teachers in 454* Schools to Items Comprising the Principals' Behavior Score on Closeness of Supervision, by Six Categories of Those Behavior Scores

Question: How frequently [always (A), almost always (AA), occasionally (O), almost never (AN), never (N)] does your principal engage in the following activities?

40. Require that teachers discuss their major classroom problems with the principal.

	A	AA	O	AN	N	No.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
Low 1	2.0	6.0	24.9	33.6	33.6	503	3.91	1.00
2	3.7	14.3	31.3	28.1	22.6	544	3.52	1.10
3	8.1	18.8	37.7	22.9	12.5	554	3.13	1.11
4	11.4	22.9	35.0	18.3	12.3	568	2.97	1.17
5	16.7	24.2	36.7	14.8	7.7	521	2.73	1.14
High 6	28.0	35.0	25.5	7.9	3.6	554	2.24	1.06
Total	11.8	20.4	31.8	20.9	15.1	3299**	3.07	1.22

37. Ask teachers to report all major conferences with parents to the principal.

	A	AA	O	AN	N	No.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
Low 1	4.1	11.0	18.5	24.2	42.1	508	3.89	1.19
2	10.9	17.3	21.0	23.1	27.7	542	3.39	1.34
3	14.1	22.3	23.6	17.8	22.3	539	3.12	1.36
4	21.4	23.7	22.6	16.9	15.5	562	2.82	1.36
5	28.9	24.6	20.5	14.2	11.8	516	2.55	1.35
High 6	43.1	26.9	15.8	9.1	5.3	551	2.07	1.19
Total	20.5	20.8	20.4	17.5	20.8	3275**	2.97	1.43

Table 3-10. (Continued)

46. Require teachers to keep the principal informed of "problem" children in their classrooms.

	A	AA	O	AN	N	No.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
Low 1	3.4	11.5	29.8	30.2	25.0	496	3.62	1.08
2	6.0	16.2	32.5	28.0	17.4	536	3.35	1.12
3	9.6	25.9	31.3	22.8	10.5	544	2.99	1.14
4	12.6	28.7	35.9	16.9	5.9	562	2.75	1.07
5	17.9	36.3	28.6	10.0	7.3	521	2.53	1.12
High 6	34.8	34.3	21.5	7.4	2.0	554	2.07	1.02
Total	14.2	25.6	30.0	18.9	11.3	3269**	2.87	1.20

39. Closely direct the work of teachers who are likely to experience difficulty.

	A	AA	O	AN	N	No.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
Low 1	2.8	10.9	28.0	32.9	25.4	504	3.67	1.06
2	5.5	18.1	35.6	27.7	13.1	542	3.25	1.07
3	10.0	29.0	36.5	17.4	7.1	551	2.83	1.06
4	14.5	34.1	31.2	15.1	5.2	558	2.62	1.07
5	19.6	34.0	30.6	12.9	2.9	520	2.45	1.04
High 6	31.3	37.8	24.0	5.1	1.8	550	2.08	0.96
Total	14.1	27.6	30.9	18.4	9.1	3281**	2.81	1.16

32. Require that teachers' classroom behavior conform to the principal's standards.

	A	AA	O	AN	N	No.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
Low 1	8.5	24.5	29.0	27.0	11.1	507	3.08	1.14
2	11.6	31.9	30.9	18.6	7.0	543	2.78	1.10
3	14.7	35.7	27.1	13.8	8.7	543	2.66	1.15
4	24.8	33.5	25.0	13.4	3.4	568	2.37	1.10
5	26.8	37.3	21.4	9.7	4.8	518	2.28	1.11
High 6	35.5	37.5	17.4	8.0	1.7	547	2.03	1.00
Total	20.5	33.4	25.0	15.1	6.1	3283**	2.53	1.15

Table 3-10. (Continued)

36. Check to see that teachers prepare written lesson plans.

	A	AA	O	AN	N	No.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
Low 1	1.6	1.8	9.5	25.2	61.9	496	4.44	0.86
2	2.6	3.1	19.6	30.8	44.0	546	4.10	0.99
3	6.1	7.7	17.7	26.9	41.6	543	3.90	1.20
4	9.6	10.3	28.4	28.7	23.1	564	3.45	1.22
5	24.5	13.2	28.0	19.0	15.3	522	2.87	1.38
High 6	31.0	17.8	27.5	15.2	8.5	552	2.53	1.30
Total	12.7	9.1	22.0	24.3	32.0	3279**	3.54	1.35

42. Know what is taking place in most classrooms during most of the day.

	A	AA	O	AN	N	No.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
Low 1	2.6	16.6	31.9	30.1	18.8	505	3.46	1.06
2	4.8	26.8	32.7	26.6	9.2	545	3.09	1.04
3	9.5	35.2	30.4	17.4	7.5	546	2.78	1.08
4	13.3	38.5	31.3	13.8	3.2	566	2.55	0.99
5	17.3	44.2	24.4	11.7	2.3	520	2.38	0.98
High 6	24.5	45.6	21.2	7.1	1.6	551	2.16	0.93
Total	12.1	35.7	28.6	17.5	7.1	3290**	2.73	1.10

48. Determine what the objectives of the guidance program should be in the school.

	A	AA	O	AN	N	No.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
Low 1	13.8	35.8	29.4	14.4	6.6	486	2.64	1.09
2	19.9	36.3	29.9	10.5	3.5	488	2.41	1.03
3	20.0	39.7	27.1	8.4	4.8	499	2.38	1.05
4	30.0	34.4	23.5	9.6	2.9	511	2.22	1.06
5	29.6	42.2	18.1	7.6	2.7	448	2.12	1.00
High 6	40.1	39.5	15.1	3.5	1.8	456	1.87	0.92
Total	25.2	37.7	24.2	9.1	3.9	2937**	2.29	1.06

* The fact that the sample of schools is 454 rather than 501 is attributable to two sources: (1) one school system did not participate in the Teacher

Table 3-10. (Continued)

* Questionnaire part of the study; (2) the omission of those schools from other systems in which fewer than four teachers returned usable questionnaires.

** Number of teachers, out of a possible 3367, responding to each item.

Table 3-11. Distribution (Percentage) of Responses by Teachers in 454* Schools to Items Comprising the Principals' Behavior Score on Support of Innovation, by Six Categories of Those Behavior Scores

Question: How frequently [always (A), almost always (AA), occasionally (O), almost never (AN), never (N)] does your principal engage in the following activities?

21. Encourage the staff to learn about and try out some of the "new ideas" coming from schools of education.

	A	AA	O	AN	N	No.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
Low 1	3.1	9.5	42.6	26.9	17.9	514	3.47	0.99
2	5.5	17.7	47.7	18.3	10.8	509	3.11	1.00
3	38.3	23.2	49.5	14.2	4.8	543	2.84	0.93
4	13.3	29.4	45.0	9.7	2.7	558	2.59	0.93
5	18.2	36.6	37.7	6.3	1.1	554	2.35	0.89
High 6	32.6	39.7	24.5	2.9	0.4	527	1.99	0.85
Total	13.6	26.3	41.2	12.8	6.1	3261**	2.72	1.05

22. Encourage new teachers to consider adopting new educational ideas which have been tried out in other communities and found to be successful.

	A	AA	O	AN	N	No.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
Low 1	1.8	12.2	42.7	24.4	18.9	508	3.47	0.99
2	4.4	17.6	46.5	20.2	11.2	499	3.16	0.99
3	8.2	22.8	48.2	14.2	6.5	535	2.88	0.97
4	9.9	29.9	44.5	13.1	2.6	548	2.69	0.91
5	18.8	34.9	39.1	5.1	2.0	547	2.37	0.91
High 6	34.3	37.2	26.1	1.9	0.6	522	1.97	0.86
Total	13.0	26.0	41.2	13.1	6.7	3213**	2.75	1.06

Table 3-11. (Continued)

25. Encourage schools of education to conduct experimental research in the school.

	A	AA	O	AN	N	No.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
Low 1	2.3	6.6	33.6	27.2	30.2	437	3.76	1.03
2	3.0	13.1	35.1	27.8	21.0	428	3.51	1.06
3	5.4	15.9	38.9	23.4	16.3	465	3.30	1.09
4	6.4	18.9	44.3	18.4	12.1	472	3.11	1.05
5	9.0	25.2	41.8	17.5	6.6	469	2.88	1.02
High 6	20.8	28.3	34.8	9.5	6.6	442	2.53	1.12
Total	7.8	18.2	38.3	20.5	15.3	2761**	3.17	1.13

19. Attempt to secure teachers in the school who are interested in experimenting with new educational ideas.

	A	AA	O	AN	N	No.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
Low 1	1.3	6.0	36.3	30.4	26.0	454	3.74	0.96
2	1.8	9.7	40.2	25.2	23.2	445	3.58	1.01
3	2.7	9.8	48.0	24.4	15.0	479	3.39	0.95
4	4.7	17.7	46.8	19.2	11.6	485	3.15	1.00
5	7.2	23.5	46.7	16.6	6.0	499	2.91	0.96
High 6	19.3	32.5	34.2	8.4	5.6	462	2.49	1.07
Total	6.2	16.7	42.1	20.7	14.4	2872**	3.20	1.07

29. Seek out new ideas to introduce into the school's program.

	A	AA	O	AN	N	No.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
Low 1	3.4	13.5	41.9	27.8	13.5	504	3.35	0.99
2	7.3	19.6	45.1	18.4	9.7	495	3.04	1.03
3	12.6	26.6	44.6	11.8	4.5	534	2.69	0.99
4	14.1	28.7	45.3	9.7	2.2	547	2.57	0.92
5	17.2	36.3	39.2	6.6	0.7	546	2.37	0.87
High 6	37.6	39.3	21.3	2.7	-	516	1.90	0.82
Total	15.3	27.3	39.6	12.8	4.9	3197**	2.65	1.04

Table 3-11. (Continued)

17. Give additional free time to teachers who are trying out new ideas in their classes.

	A	AA	O	AN	N	No.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
Low 1	1.0	3.3	23.4	22.8	49.6	492	4.17	0.96
2	0.8	9.1	30.9	24.3	34.9	485	3.83	1.03
3	2.8	10.8	31.6	21.2	33.6	509	3.72	1.12
4	4.6	13.3	35.4	22.3	24.4	520	3.49	1.13
5	5.6	15.7	36.2	20.0	22.5	516	3.38	1.16
High 6	12.1	21.9	35.2	13.1	18.8	489	3.03	1.24
Total	4.5	12.4	32.2	20.8	30.2	3065**	3.60	1.17

* The fact that the sample of schools is 454 rather than 501 is attributable to two sources: (1) one school system did not participate in the Teacher Questionnaire part of the study; (2) the omission of those schools from other systems in which fewer than four teachers returned usable questionnaires.

** Number of teachers, out of a possible 3367, responding to each item.

Table 3-12. Distribution (Percentage) of Responses by Teachers in 453^{*} Schools to Items Comprising the Principals' Behavior Score on Parental Involvement, by Six Categories of Those Behavior Scores

Question: How frequently [always (A), almost always (AA), occasionally (O), almost never (AN), never (N)] does your principal engage in the following activities?

7. Encourage a group of parents to discuss and help formulate the educational philosophy to be used in the school.

	A	AA	O	AN	N	No.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
Low 1	0.5	2.7	14.9	31.8	50.1	409	4.28	0.85
2	1.1	3.9	25.6	31.3	38.1	438	4.01	0.95
3	1.1	7.2	30.0	28.2	33.6	444	3.86	1.00
4	2.4	9.3	33.3	27.9	27.1	451	3.68	1.05
5	2.5	9.7	43.4	23.4	21.1	445	3.51	1.02
High 6	8.1	18.3	35.5	21.9	16.2	420	3.20	1.16
Total	2.6	8.5	30.6	27.6	30.6	2653 ^{**}	3.75	1.06

15. Use interested parents as volunteer part-time "teacher helpers."

	A	AA	O	AN	N	No.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
Low 1	-	-	4.0	9.6	86.4	398	4.82	0.48
2	0.5	0.2	7.2	12.9	79.2	419	4.70	0.65
3	0.5	3.1	11.8	17.5	67.1	423	4.48	0.85
4	1.6	1.6	18.2	20.2	58.4	445	4.32	0.93
5	3.1	4.9	21.5	23.1	47.5	451	4.07	1.08
High 6	7.3	7.6	37.4	19.6	28.1	423	3.54	1.19
Total	2.2	2.9	16.8	17.6	60.7	2610 ^{**}	4.31	1.00

Table 3-12. (Continued)

10. Encourage parents to help during school hours on school or class trips or projects.

	A	AA	O	AN	N	No.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
Low 1	1.4	5.7	31.2	31.6	30.0	490	3.83	0.97
2	4.2	8.0	49.0	24.9	13.9	498	3.36	0.96
3	4.3	13.0	44.2	28.4	10.1	507	3.27	0.96
4	13.4	20.3	45.9	14.8	5.6	553	2.79	1.03
5	17.8	29.0	39.4	10.8	3.0	538	2.52	1.00
High 6	31.8	32.4	29.1	4.7	2.0	512	2.13	0.98
Total	12.2	18.3	40.2	18.9	10.4	3155**	2.97	1.13

3. Use interested parents as an advisory group when making out the course of study.

	A	AA	O	AN	N	No.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
Low 1	0.6	0.3	9.4	23.9	65.8	360	4.54	0.72
2	-	1.4	17.0	26.2	55.5	348	4.36	0.81
3	0.8	4.8	23.3	29.2	41.8	373	4.06	0.96
4	0.5	5.3	23.2	29.1	41.9	375	4.06	0.95
5	1.1	7.8	31.4	23.8	36.0	370	3.86	1.03
High 6	4.7	12.7	35.3	20.6	26.8	340	3.52	1.15
Total	1.2	5.4	23.2	25.7	44.5	2205**	4.07	1.00

12. Encourage interested parent groups to evaluate how well the school is achieving its curricular objectives.

	A	AA	O	AN	N	No.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
Low 1	1.6	2.3	16.0	28.5	51.7	445	4.27	0.92
2	2.6	4.9	24.2	33.3	35.0	468	3.93	1.01
3	3.8	10.3	26.5	29.3	30.1	475	3.72	1.11
4	4.3	9.1	30.3	27.4	28.9	508	3.68	1.11
5	3.9	10.6	38.4	26.8	20.3	482	3.49	1.05
High 6	12.0	15.7	37.0	18.4	16.9	451	3.12	1.22
Total	4.6	8.8	29.0	27.2	30.4	2881**	3.70	1.13

Table 3-12. (Continued)

8. Encourage parental attendance at school assemblies.

	A	AA	O	AN	N	No.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
Low 1	8.0	9.4	49.7	20.8	12.0	499	3.19	1.03
2	14.5	18.0	52.7	10.0	4.8	518	2.73	0.99
3	20.7	21.7	42.0	12.6	3.0	531	2.56	1.05
4	27.1	25.6	35.8	9.3	2.2	550	2.34	1.04
5	32.2	29.7	31.0	5.6	1.5	522	2.15	1.00
High 6	44.0	25.9	25.3	4.2	0.6	482	1.92	0.91
Total	24.2	21.6	39.8	10.4	4.0	3160**	2.48	1.09

* The fact that the sample of schools is 453 rather than 501 is attributable to two sources: (1) one school system did not participate in the Teacher Questionnaire part of the study; (2) the omission of those schools from other systems in which fewer than four teachers returned usable questionnaires.

** Number of teachers, out of a possible 3367, responding to each item.

Notes and References for Chapter Three

1. We shall describe the procedures for measuring other variables in our analyses when they are first introduced in later chapters.
2. U. S. Office of Education, Biennial Survey of Education in the United States, 1955-1956 (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1959).
3. See Henry F. Kaiser, "The Varimax Criterion for Analytic Rotation in Factor Analysis," Psychometrika, XXIII (1958), pp. 187-200; or Henry F. Kaiser, "Computer Program for Varimax Rotation in Factor Analysis," Educational and Psychological Measurement, XIX (1960), pp. 413-420.
4. Harry H. Harman, Modern Factor Analysis (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960), Chapter XVI.
5. The weights assigned the response categories in computing the correlation matrix were as follows: "absolutely must" (5), "preferably should" (4), "may or may not" (3), "preferably should not" (2), "absolutely must not" (1).
6. In developing measures of principals' role behavior, we had three options for choosing the best available observers: teachers, higher administrators, or principals themselves. Although the principals were able to describe their own behavior, there was the danger that they might inadvertently exaggerate the consistency between their reports of self-expectations and those of behavior. Higher administrators could serve as reasonably objective observers; we found, however, that they often did not see each principal at work often or long enough to describe his behavior, this being especially true among recently appointed principals.

Teachers, however, are in the best position to observe a principal in many aspects of his work and over extended periods of time. For this reason, therefore, we based all indices of principals' behavior upon the observations of teachers within their respective schools. See Appendix A-1 for specimens of the Teacher Questionnaire designed to yield information about the principals' role behavior.

Chapter 4: The Effects of Principals' Role Performance on Their Schools

A basic premise of sociology is that forces in a social system influence the conduct of individual members. This idea will assume a central place in the explanation we shall offer in Chapter Five to account for the degree to which principals conform to their own role definitions. However, it is also a basic premise of our study that the order of events can be reversed: the role behavior of individuals influences the operation of social systems in which they participate.

In this chapter we are concerned with how the role behavior of men in top positions affect the operation of organizations. It is in this sense, as we argued earlier in Chapter Two, that different types of role behavior are problematic for organizational functioning.

We have selected for intensive study those types of role behavior that reflect the ways leaders cope with three central organizational problems: the supervision of personnel, their support of innovation, and the involvement of clients in organizational affairs. Our basic assumption was that the way an executive copes with these problems has consequences for organizational operation, in particular, staff morale, efforts of personnel to offer maximum service to their clients, and the organizational product. We now turn to our findings about the influence of principals' role performance on these three aspects of school operation.

Teachers' Morale

Schools, like factories and hospitals, vary in staff morale, ". . . the capacity of a group of people to pull together persistently and consistently

in pursuit of a common purpose."¹ Teachers' morale may be evidenced by pride in and loyalty to their school, their cooperative relationship with their fellow teachers, their acceptance of its educational philosophy, and their enjoyment of their work. What impact does the behavior of the principal have on teachers' morale?

Closeness of Supervision

The first question to be examined is: What relationship, if any, exists between the closeness of supervision a principal exercises over his teachers and their morale? Our hypothesis was that the more closely a principal supervises his teachers, the lower their morale. We anticipated a negative relationship between these variables on the basis of the following lines of reasoning.

First, we assumed that a circumstance leading to low staff morale would be the failure of a superordinate to act in accordance with salient expectations of his subordinates. We also assumed that because of the professional nature of their work, teachers would expect their principals to grant them considerable autonomy in their classroom activities. We then reasoned that the more closely a principal supervised, the more his teachers would feel he was violating their prerogatives and that this violation would result in low staff morale.

Second, a superordinate who supervises closely interferes with the gratification of strongly felt personal needs. This assumption has been used to explain the negative relationship between close supervision and morale found in previous studies that have been conducted in work settings in which subordinates apparently have no legitimate basis to expect their

supervisors to grant them a great deal of freedom, for example, in industrial and clerical situations. In summarizing a series of studies conducted by the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan, Kahn and Katz say:

Close supervision often is employed as an institutional device for insuring that workers follow their job assignments correctly and assiduously. But this very practice also has negative morale and motivation implications, and some supervisors may give more freedom to their employees as a way of increasing their motivation. The greater freedom may produce positive results through the satisfaction that the individual has in participation and in self-determination. There is considerable evidence to support the interpretation in the research findings. In the tractor company studied, workers who perceived their foremen as supervising them less closely were better satisfied with their jobs and with the company.

In the same study, each worker was asked how much he had to say about the way his own job was done, and whether he would like to have more or less to say on the subject. Workers who reported having a lot to say about their own work wanted no less, and were relatively high on the three dimensions of morale--satisfaction with job, supervisor, and company. Workers who reported having little to say about how their jobs should be done wanted more autonomy in this area, and were relatively dissatisfied with their jobs, their

supervisors, and the company. Apparently, close supervision can interfere with the gratification of some strongly felt needs (*italics ours*).²

To test the hypothesis we measured teachers' morale on the basis of teacher responses to the following six questions: "Of the teachers in your school, what per cent:"

1. Display a sense of pride in the school.
2. Enjoy working in the school.
3. Display a sense of loyalty to the school.
4. Respect the judgment of the administrators of the school.
5. Accept the educational philosophy underlying the curriculum of the school.
6. Work cooperatively with their fellow teachers.

The mean of the responses of the four to ten teacher-observers in each school to each item was calculated to obtain an averaged report of their responses. When we intercorrelated the averaged reports for these six questions, we found a high degree of association among them, indicating that a summary measure of teachers' morale could be developed. A principal components factor analysis was then performed on the 6 x 6 correlation matrix. The resulting factor weights were applied to these averaged reports and a summary score on teachers' morale was obtained for each school.³

When we correlated the principals' scores on closeness of supervision with the morale scores of their staffs, we found no support for

our hypothesis: the Pearsonian correlation coefficients for each school level -- elementary, junior high, and senior high -- are positive and the last two are significant statistically at below the .05 level (Table 4-1). The findings, in short, contradict the hypothesis. What could account for these findings so different from those found in other studies?

One possibility is that the assumption that teachers do not want close supervision from their principals is erroneous. We had assumed that teachers would expect a principal to grant them considerable autonomy in their classroom activities; therefore if he attempted to supervise their activities closely, they would experience low morale because his behavior violated one of their basic norms, the desire for autonomy. If, however, most teachers in fact expect their school principal to exercise considerable control over their activities, then a high degree of supervision would represent conforming, not deviant, behavior and hence would result in high morale.

To explore this possibility, we examined the expectations that teachers hold for each of the eight items included in the measure of the principals' behavior on closeness of supervision (Table 4-2). Their responses indicate that the autonomy assumption was in error. For seven of the eight supervision activities, only a relatively small minority of the teachers responded that principals "preferably should not" or "absolutely must not" engage in them and a majority replied that they "absolutely must" or "preferably should." For example, 60 per cent gave positive and only 10 per cent negative responses to the item, "require that teachers discuss their major classroom problems with the principal," and 67

Table 4-1. The Relationship between Principals' Closeness of Supervision and Teachers' Morale, by School Level
(Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	r	N
Elementary	.12	165
Junior High	.35	121
Senior High	.30	137

* $p < .05$; two-tailed test.

Table 4-2. The Distribution of Teachers' Expectations for Principals' Closeness of Supervision

Question: Do you feel the principal of your school [absolutely must (AM), preferably should (PS), may or may not (MMN), preferably should not (PSN), absolutely must not (AMN)] engage in the following activities?

Item*	AM	PS	MMN	PSN	AMN	No.**	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
40. Require that teachers discuss their major classroom problems with the principal.	16.1	43.9	30.1	7.9	2.0	3321	2.36	0.91
37. Ask teachers to report all major conferences with parents to the principal.	18.7	38.0	30.3	10.7	2.3	3301	2.40	0.98
46. Require teachers to keep the principal informed of "problem" children in their classrooms.	19.2	47.5	27.2	5.4	0.7	3297	2.21	0.84
39. Closely direct the work of teachers who are likely to experience difficulty.	29.6	52.0	13.9	3.9	0.6	3322	1.94	0.80
32. Require that teachers' classroom behavior conform to the principal's standards.	17.8	38.1	26.1	14.0	4.0	3311	2.48	1.06
36. Check to see that teachers prepare written lesson plans.	7.9	24.8	39.8	21.2	6.4	3300	2.93	1.01

Table 4-2. (Continued)

Item*	AM	PS	MMN	PSN	AMN	No.**	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
42. Know what is taking place in most classrooms during most of the day.	20.1	51.8	23.0	4.0	1.2	3312	2.14	0.82
48. Determine what the objectives of the guidance program should be in the school.	37.0	46.5	12.6	3.2	0.7	3018	1.84	0.85

* Items are numbered according to their position in the research instrument.

** Number of teachers, out of a possible 3367, responding to each item.

per cent felt that principals "preferably should" or "absolutely must" "require teachers to keep the principal informed of 'problem' children in their classrooms," while only 6 per cent held negative expectations for such behavior.

The one item in which a majority of the teachers did not express a clear-cut preference for close supervision was "check to see that teachers prepare written lesson plans." Only 33 per cent responded that the principal "absolutely must" or "preferably should" do this, and 27 per cent expressed negative expectations in this respect. But 40 per cent of the teachers responded that he "may or may not" engage in this behavior, suggesting that if a principal felt it necessary to supervise closely they would not judge this performance as out-of-bounds.

In short, our data on expectations of teachers provide no support for the widely held assumption, and one that we made in deriving the hypothesis, that teachers in general expect their principals to exercise little supervision over their activities. The fact that the majority of teachers approve of the principal's exercise of close supervision therefore could account for our findings.

There are other possible reasons why a hypothesis contrary to the one we proposed received empirical support. We had assumed on the basis of studies conducted in other kinds of work settings that the less subordinates experienced close surveillance, the more they would experience the gratification of certain strongly felt psychological needs. However, this line of reasoning was not supported in the case of the schools. Why not? One possibility is that regardless of the amount of supervision principals exercise over the activities of teachers, they still have

considerable opportunity in their classrooms to use their initiative and judgment in carrying out their tasks. Another is that in work settings such as schools where teachers work largely in isolation from each other and spend most of their time with non-adults, they may welcome close supervision for it provides one of the few opportunities for them to associate with, and receive recognition from, a professional adult colleague. Regardless of whether these speculations are correct, it is clear that our findings about the relationship between closeness of supervision and morale in schools is contrary to that reported for other institutional contexts.

Support of Innovation

We now turn to the relationship between the principal's support of innovation and staff morale. Our hypothesis is based on two assumptions: first, that the more a principal conforms to teachers' expectations, the higher their morale; and second, that most teachers expect their principals to support the introduction of innovations into their schools. From these assumptions, the hypothesis follows that there will be a positive relationship between a principal's support of innovation and the morale of his staff.

When we related the principal's score on support of innovation to our index of teachers' morale, we found support for the hypothesis: for principals in elementary, junior high, and senior high schools, there was a positive relationship between their support of innovation and the morale of their staffs (Table 4-3).

Table 4-3. The Relationship between Principals' Support of Innovation and Teachers' Morale, by School Level
(Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	<u>r</u>	N
Elementary	.39*	165
Junior High	.27*	121
Senior High	.41*	137

* $p < .05$; one-tailed test.

Principals' Involvement of Parents in School Affairs

Is there any relationship between a principal's involvement of parents in school affairs and staff morale? The hypothesis we tested was based on the following reasoning.

We assumed that teachers view themselves as technical specialists and, therefore, that they would resent lay interference in school activities. Hence, the principal who attempts to involve parents centrally in school decisions would be creating a situation threatening to the interests of his teaching staff because he would extend to non-experts the right to pass judgment on the quality of service or to decide in the first place what the service ought to entail. To the extent that a principal invites parents to participate in areas close to the jurisdiction of teachers, he potentially diminishes the staff's stature as experts by tacitly admitting that parents, who lack both training and practical experience as teachers, should be taken seriously in matters pertaining to education. If we assume further that activities of a principal that threaten the interests of his teachers and diminish their stature are conducive to their low morale, it follows that the more a principal involves parents in school affairs, the lower the teachers' morale.

Table 4-4 offers no support for the anticipated negative relationship between parent participation and morale at any school level; in fact, the data show that the more a principal involves parents in school activities the greater the morale of his teachers. What could account for these findings?

One possibility is that the assumption that teachers generally

Table 4-4. The Relationship between Principals' Involvement of Parents in School Affairs and Teachers' Morale, by School Level (Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	<u>r</u>	<u>N</u>
Elementary	.29*	165
Junior High	.38*	121
Senior High	.29*	137

* $p < .05$; two-tailed test.

disapprove of parental involvement in school activities may have been erroneous. Table 4-5 presents the expectations teachers hold for their principal's involvement of parents in school affairs. It reveals that for relatively passive kinds of involvement in school activities (for example, parental attendance at assemblies or helping on school trips or projects) the majority of teachers favor such involvement. But with respect to the involvement of parents in policy and instructional matters (for example, examining the educational philosophy of the school or serving as part-time teacher helpers), although substantial proportions of teachers approve these activities, a much greater proportion of them do not. This line of speculation does not appear to be helpful in accounting for the positive relationship between the principal's involvement of parents in school affairs and morale.

Perhaps a more fruitful explanation may be found elsewhere. Primary and secondary education in this country is publicly controlled and receives substantial support from the local community, a fact reflecting an ideological theme that the schools should be responsive to the needs of the locality. One important corollary of this pattern of local control and financial support is that parents have a right to be heard on matters of local school policy, not only through representative school boards but also through access to the schools themselves where they are free to talk with principals, teachers, and other school personnel.

In recognition of the right of community members to take an active interest in the operation of schools and of the need for schools to be responsive to community needs (and pressures), many school officials

Table 4-5. The Distribution of Teachers' Expectations for Principals' Involvement of Parents in School Affairs

Question: Do you feel the principal of your school [absolutely must (AM), preferably should (PS), may or may not (MMN), preferably should not (PSN), absolutely must not (AMN)] engage in the following activities?

Item*	AM	PS	MMN	PSN	AMN	No.**	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
7. Encourage a group of parents to discuss and help formulate the educational philosophy to be used in the school.	3.8	24.5	32.6	25.3	13.8	2781	3.21	1.08
15. Use interested parents as volunteer part-time "teacher-helpers."	1.8	19.5	32.0	26.9	19.7	2706	3.43	1.07
10. Encourage parents to help during school hours on school or class trips or projects.	9.8	44.0	35.0	9.6	1.7	3193	2.49	0.86
3. Use interested parents as an advisory group when making out the course of study.	1.7	16.4	38.8	27.1	16.0	2343	3.39	0.99
12. Encourage interested parent groups to evaluate how well the school is achieving its curricular objectives.	4.6	24.6	35.6	22.6	12.4	2990	2.14	1.07
8. Encourage parental attendance at school assemblies.	14.2	44.0	35.2	5.6	1.0	3186	2.35	0.83

*Items are numbered according to their position in the research instrument.

**Number of teachers, out of a possible 3367, responding to each item.

expend considerable effort in explaining the nature of their educational program to the parents and to other groups in the community in order to gain their general acceptance of the school program and to forestall hostile reactions. Gaining public acceptance for a school program in one sense is a public relations function necessitated by the vulnerability of school systems to the vagaries of community opinion and local interests; in another sense, it may represent a mode of protecting teachers from exposure to parental criticism and attack that might well be intense when the community is not initially prepared to accept what the schools are doing.

The principal who in the process of involving parents in school affairs skillfully interprets the workings of his organization to them and successfully gains both acceptance for the program and parental allegiance to the school thereby can prevent school-parent conflicts and protects the interests of his teachers. Inviting parents into the decision-making councils of the school is a delicate issue for a principal, but if most principals deal with them effectively and thereby absorb the pressures that might otherwise be directed toward teachers, we would expect their skill could contribute to high teacher morale. Our findings suggest that this may in fact be taking place.

Teacher Effort

Anyone who visits a number of classrooms is struck by the variations in the extent to which teachers attempt to offer maximum service to pupils. Some schools have on their faculties teachers who typically engage only in

textbook teaching while in others most staff members expose their pupils to a variety of instructional materials. Schools vary in the extent to which their teachers waste or maximize classroom time for learning purposes. They also vary in the efforts of the faculty to support the introduction of new educational programs, in the proportion of teachers who experiment with new techniques, or who try to improve the quality of their teaching.

Teacher behavior of these kinds, performance reflecting strong or weak effort to be of maximum service to pupils, concerns us in this section. We are interested in discovering whether the role performance of principals is related to these kinds of teacher efforts.

Closeness of Supervision

What type of association could be anticipated between teachers' efforts to offer maximum service to their pupils and the closeness of their principal's supervision? Our answer to this question was influenced by our speculations about the inconsistent findings of previous studies on the relationship between closeness of supervision and worker productivity.⁴ A possible explanation of these disparate findings, as Dubin⁵ has noted, is that the work technology of the organizations studied varied in important respects and hence that organizational context may account for them: "...productive supervisory practices are those appropriate to the organizations in which the supervision functions. Different kinds of supervisory behavior are effective because they are suited to special kinds of organizations."⁶

In the case of schools, we hypothesized that there would be a positive relationship between closeness of supervision and teacher effort for the following reasons: first, surveillance provides opportunities for a principal to learn about the attitudes, expectations, grievances, and feelings of teachers and this can provide him with opportunities to gain the knowledge required to stimulate teachers to do their jobs with energy and devotion. Second, a principal who supervises closely is in effect auditing the performance of his staff and communicating that maximum effort to serve pupils will be rewarded and minimum effort will expose them to negative sanctions. Third, a principal who exercises close supervision over his teachers, for example, by holding regular conferences with them about their classroom problems, accustoms them to the idea that it is normal for teachers to be exposed to difficulties and that he constitutes a resource for exploring ways to resolve them.

To test our hypothesis, a measure of the variation among schools in the effort of their teachers to serve the interests of pupils was required. We developed one from the responses of the four to ten teacher-observers in each school to the following questions: "Of the teachers in your school, what per cent:"

1. Are committed to doing the best job of which they are capable.
2. Maintain a professional attitude towards their work.
3. Maintain an interest in improving the educational program of the school.
4. Maintain effective discipline in their classes.
5. Try new teaching methods in their classrooms.

6. Waste a lot of time in their classroom activities.
7. Do "textbook teaching" only.
8. Usually "drag their feet" when new ideas are introduced into the school program.

An examination of the correlation matrix of the averaged reports to these questions showed that they were highly interrelated and that a single dimension might be extracted from them as a summary measure of Teacher Effort. These averaged reports to each item for each school were subjected to a principal components factor analysis, and on the basis of the resulting factor weights, a Teacher Effort score was computed for each school.⁶ It is this summary score that we use in testing the hypothesis.

The findings reveal support for our hypothesis: the closer the supervision a principal exercises over staff members, the greater their effort to be of maximum service to their pupils (Table 4-6). At each school level, the relationship is positive and significant statistically at below the .05 level.

Support of Innovation

Now we inquire what impact, if any, the principal's support of innovation has on teacher effort. Our hypothesis was that there would be a positive relationship between these variables. We reasoned that a school principal whose behavior reflected a strong positive orientation to introducing new educational ideas into his school would in effect be communicating to his staff his belief that it is an obligation of schools,

Table 4-6. The Relationship between Principals' Closeness of Supervision and Teacher Effort, by School Level
(Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	r	N
Elementary	.20*	166
Junior High	.35*	121
Senior High	.31*	137

* $p < .05$; one-tailed test.

and therefore of teachers, to improve the quality of services they offer to their clients; such a working environment, we assumed, would stimulate teachers to maximize their efforts to serve their pupils while one characterized by a negative or apathetic orientation to new educational ideas would tend to lead to lackadaisical or minimum effort on the part of teachers.

The findings reveal support for the hypothesis (Table 4-7). At each of the school levels there is a positive and statistically significant relationship between the support of innovation exhibited by the principal and the teachers' effort to offer maximum service to pupils.

Principals' Involvement of Parents in School Affairs

Two lines of reasoning, each leading to an opposite conclusion, at first appeared reasonable as bases for developing a hypothesis about the relationship of the principal's involvement of parents in school affairs to the teachers' efforts to be of maximum service to pupils. The first was based on the assumption that the staff as personnel with professional status would react negatively to their principal's involvement of parents in school activities because its members would feel that the principal had no right to grant parents as laymen the privilege to participate in the evaluation of the school's program or in determining its objectives. Principals who encouraged parent participation would thereby tend to lessen the morale of the staff, and this could lead to their expending less effort in being of maximum service to pupils. We have seen earlier, however, that the empirical findings do not support this line of reasoning since parental involvement was positively, not negatively, related to staff morale.

Table 4-7. The Relationship between Principals' Support of Innovation and Teacher Effort, by School Level
(Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	r	N
Elementary	.38*	166
Junior High	.30*	121
Senior High	.37*	137

* $p < .05$; one-tailed test.

The second line of reasoning leads to the hypothesis we tested: the principal's involvement of parents in school affairs is positively related to the efforts of teachers to be of service to their pupils. It was based on the intervening variable of parental pressure. That is, we assumed that the more a principal involved parents in school activities, the more opportunity they would have to exert pressure on the staff to offer maximum service to their children. If we further assume that such pressure leads to greater effort on the part of teachers to serve their pupils, then it would follow that principals who involve parents in school affairs would be setting in motion forces that would result in greater teacher effort.

The findings reveal support for the hypothesis suggested by the second line of reasoning: for each school level the more the principal involves parents in school affairs, the greater the effort teachers make to offer maximum service to their pupils (Table 4-8).

Pupil Academic Performance

In the preceding sections of this chapter we have seen that the ways principals cope with three basic problems of their organizations have effects on teachers' morale and their classroom performance. Now we direct our attention to the influence that principals' role behavior might have on the performance of pupils.

Table 4-8. The Relationship between Principals' Involvement of Parents in School Affairs and Teacher Effort, by School Level (Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	<u>r</u>	N
Elementary	.29*	166
Junior High	.42*	121
Senior High	.32*	137

* $p < .05$; one-tailed test.

Closeness of Supervision

Is there a relationship between the closeness of supervision a principal exercises over his staff and the learning of pupils in his school?

It was our assumption that the principal's influence on pupil learning is indirect; that is, mediated through his impact on his teachers. If we further assume that closeness of supervision is positively related to teacher effort (and we have shown that the evidence supports this assumption) and if such effort has positive effects on pupil learning, then the hypothesis follows that the closeness of supervision a principal exercises over his staff will be positively related to pupil performance.

To obtain an index of the amount of pupil learning occurring in each school in our sample, we asked teachers a series of questions about the pupils in their classes. The five questions were: "Of the students you teach, what per cent:"

1. Are not mastering the subject matter or skills you teach at the minimum level of satisfactory performance.
2. Are one or more years behind grade level in reading
3. Were not adequately prepared to do the grade level work expected of them when they entered your class (or classes).
4. Are not interested in academic achievement.
5. Work up to their intellectual capacities.

The intercorrelation of the averaged scores for each school to these five questions revealed that they were highly related, suggesting

that a summary index of pupil learning could be developed. A principal components factor analysis was then performed on the correlation matrix and the resulting factor weights were then attached to the averaged reports to each item for each school and a summary pupil academic performance score obtained for each of them.⁷

In testing this hypothesis we shall take into account a variable that numerous studies have shown to be highly related to pupils' learning: their socio-economic status.⁸ In our study the relationship between indices of socio-economic status of the student body and its academic performance is substantial: for elementary schools it is .48, for junior highs .50, and senior highs .55. By controlling for this variable, we can be assured that its effect on the relationship between closeness of supervision and pupils' learning will be eliminated. The partial correlation coefficients at each school level between closeness of supervision and pupils' learning, holding the socio-economic status of the student body constant, are presented in Table 4-9. The findings reveal support for the hypothesis for all school levels.

Support of Innovation

What impact, if any, does the principal's support of innovation have on pupils' academic performance? On the one hand, it can be argued that behavior of this type would have negative effects. The more a principal encourages his staff to adopt innovations the greater the probability that he would create unstable conditions in the teachers' work and increase their work loads. On the other hand, it could be maintained that

Table 4-9. First-Order Partial Correlation Coefficients for the Relationship between Principals' Closeness of Supervision and Pupil Academic Achievement, by School Level (Holding Socio-Economic Status of Schools Constant)

	Partial r	N
Elementary	.19*	166
Junior High	.21*	120
Senior High	.15*	137

* $p < .05$; one-tailed test.

as in the case of closeness of supervision, his support of innovation tends to result in greater teacher effort which in turn has positive effects on academic performance. In view of these possible contrary contentions, we did not test a hypothesis in this instance but decided to explore whether there was a relationship between the principal's support of innovation and pupil academic performance when the socio-economic status of the school is held constant.

The findings reveal that there is a positive relationship at the junior high level between these variables but that they are not associated at the elementary and senior high levels (Table 4-10).

Principals' Involvement of Parents in School Affairs

Does the principal's involvement of parents in school affairs have any impact on pupil academic performance? Our hypothesis was that these variables would be positively related. We assumed that when the principal involves parents in school affairs they tend to take a more active interest in their children's academic activities and this in turn would have positive consequences for pupils' performance. By encouraging parents to participate in school activities, the principal, in short, would be setting in motion forces that would eventuate in positive learning effects.

As in the two preceding analyses, we shall control for the socio-economic status of the school in examining the relationship between the principal's involvement of parents in school affairs and pupils' academic performance. The findings reveal support for the hypothesis only at the junior high school level (Table 4-11).

Table 4-10. First-Order Partial Correlation Coefficients for the Relationship between Principals' Support of Innovation and Pupil Academic Achievement, by School Level (Holding Socio-Economic Status of Schools Constant)

	Partial r	N
Elementary	.04	166
Junior High	.19*	120
Senior High	.00	137

* $p < .05$; two-tailed test.

Table 4-11. First-Order Partial Correlation Coefficients for the Relationship between Principals' Involvement of Parents in School Affairs and Pupil Academic Achievement, by School Level (Holding Socio-Economic Status of Schools Constant)

	Partial r	N
Elementary	.03	166
Junior High	.22*	120
Senior High	.06	137

* $p < .05$; one-tailed test.

Notes and References for Chapter Four

1. Alexander H. Leighton, "Applied Science of Human Relations," Personnel Administration, IX (1947), p. 3.
2. Robert L. Kahn and Daniel Katz, "Leadership Practices in Relation to Productivity and Morale," in Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander (Editors), Group Dynamics, Second Edition (Evanston: Row, Peterson and Co., 1960), p. 560.
3. See Appendix B-1 for a description of the statistical properties of the morale measure.
4. Robert Dubin, "Supervision and Productivity: Empirical Findings and Theoretical Considerations," in Robert Dubin, et al., Leadership and Productivity (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1965), p. 3.
5. Dubin, op. cit., pp. 28-29.
6. See Appendix B-2 for a description of the statistical properties of the teacher effort measure.
7. See Appendix B-3 for a description of the statistical properties of the pupil academic performance measure.
8. See Appendix B-4 for a description of the statistical properties of the socio-economic status of schools measure.

Chapter 2: Conformity to Self-expectations for Role Performance: The Theoretical Formulation and Methodological Issues

In the previous chapter we examined the influence of principals' actions on the operation of their schools. In this and the three following chapters we shall be concerned with the second major problem of the study: accounting for variation in the degree to which principals conform to their own definition of their roles. Chapters Six, Seven, and Eight deal with the determinants of their conformity to self-expectations in the areas of supervision, support of innovation, and parental involvement in school affairs, respectively. All hypotheses presented in the three next chapters are based on a single theoretical formulation designed to account for the degree to which organizational executives conform to their self-expectations for role performance. In this chapter we present the basic assumptions and reasoning underlying this formulation and the methodological implications that derive from it.

The Theoretical Framework

The problem is to account for variation in the degree to which executives conform to their self-expectations. Our concern is not with variation in role behavior per se but with variation in conformity to self-expectations. Our analysis of this problem is based on the following set of assumptions for dealing with this problem.

We begin with the assumption that executives are predisposed to conform to their own conception of how they should do their work and hold a set of expectations for their own role performance. Since these standards represent how they believe they should behave, we maintain that they

will derive personal gratification and a sense of accomplishment if they act in accord with them. We are not concerned with the sources of these self-expectations but assume that they exist and that executives are pre-disposed to conform to them.

The executives do not, however, work in a social vacuum. They are involved in complex organizational settings whose characteristics make conformity to self-expectations problematic. We assume that before principals act with reference to their role they attempt to anticipate the risks, ascertain whether a course of action intended as a contribution to the good of the organization and as a source of personal accomplishment could actually create serious difficulties both for the organization and themselves.

There are several aspects of his work environment that we assume a principal takes into account in weighing the risks: that his school (1) is but one unit in a larger system of schools where the system is a political and administrative entity in its own right; (2) is located in a geographical area and serves the children and parents who reside in it; and (3) is composed of staff members with varying professional qualifications, social characteristics, and attitudes toward their work and toward him.

He would thus consider how his actions might affect the interests of persons located elsewhere in the school system, in the school community, and within his school; he would furthermore consider how his behavior could affect his own interests, for example, the willingness of others to follow his leadership, or his career advancement. Thus, we

maintain, there is no reason to believe that if he acts according to his own conceptions of how to carry out his job that he will also meet the demands of his superiors, conform to system-wide policies, satisfy the multiplicity of interests in the school community, provide the best educational services for children, or make provision for the unique problems faced by each teacher in the classroom. We postulate then that the principal acts as if he were aware that by conforming to his own definition of his role he may create situations of stress and conflict for other people whose lives and work are directly affected by what he does and in so doing create risks for himself.

Risks arise out of the principal's dealings with people who are directly concerned with what takes place in school but whose interests and perspectives differ from his own. In conforming to his self-role definition, he may thus jeopardize his relationships, for example, with:

1. Administrative superiors: by failing to adhere to system-wide policies or to the expectations held for him by his superordinates, he may hurt his chances for advancement, provoke censure, or alienate superiors who are in a position to offer him support and assistance.
2. Teachers: by not conforming to their expectations, by upsetting the balance of power among factions, by increasing their work load, or by creating confusion in a previously viable set of working relationships, he may damage morale, encourage turnover, or expose himself to inordinate pressures from teachers having conflicting interests.
3. Parents: by remaining inaccessible, or by introducing controversial changes that potentially affect the life chances of pupils, he may

become the target of community pressure or find himself caught in the crossfire of hitherto latent conflicts within the community.

To this point we have made two basic assumptions, first that the principal is predisposed to conform to his own expectations for his performance, and second, that before acting he takes into account the risks he will encounter in conforming to them.

Our third basic assumption is that the greater the risk involved in a proposed course of action, the less likely the executive will undertake it, and the less the risk the more likely he will. If these assumptions are tenable, a principal's conformity to his own role definition will in part depend on (a) the magnitude of the risks to which he thinks he will be exposed; (b) the presence of risk-mitigating conditions, including his own skills and resources to cope with potential risks; and (c) the presence of overriding considerations to which a principal assigns a priority sufficient to govern his notions in the face of prevailing risks.

Methodological Issues

- In contrast to sociologists who attempt to account for variations in behavior by relating them to social conditions, often neglecting the characteristics of individuals, we approach the present problem from the standpoint of the individual's own conception of how he should act -- a psychological characteristic -- but in the context of the organization he directs in his capacity as the formally designated leader. Specifically, we are concerned with the conditions under which a principal acts in accordance with his own conception of how he should act (i.e., conforms to

his self-expectations).

In the Role Questionnaire completed by principals, we asked whether or not and to what degree they felt personally obliged to act in certain ways; they could respond by checking one of the following precoded categories: "absolutely must," "preferably should," "may or may not," "preferably should not," and "absolutely must not." Since we are concerned here with conformity, only those responses indicating either a positive or negative sentiment about each activity in question (as stated in the questionnaire items) were applicable to this analysis.¹

We could measure behavioral conformity to self-expectations only when the principal expressed either positive or negative sentiments about each activity. Empirically, however, the overwhelming majority of principals felt that they should supervise closely and should support innovation; a bare majority felt that they should encourage parental involvement in school affairs. Although logically principals could refrain from acting in ways they disapproved, in fact there were too few cases of opposition for us to analyze the data; we restricted the analysis, therefore, only to those principals who were positively disposed.

The immediate implication of this restriction was to eliminate from the analysis those principals whose self-expectations were negative and those whose responses indicated either a conditional or indifferent attitude.² Earlier, in Chapter Three, we noted that each principal was assigned a score based on a factor analysis of items designed to tap his self-expectations in each of the three areas of role behavior. The score consisted of a summary measure of responses each having its own factor

weight.³ To discover whether a principal was positively or negatively disposed, for example, to close supervision, we returned to the raw data to discover his responses to the eight items comprising our measure of self-expectations and calculated each principal's mean response across the items. These means could range from 5.00 to 1.00, corresponding to the five response alternatives.

We dropped from the sample the few principals whose mean scores ranged from 2.00 to 1.00 (those with strong negative self-expectations) and those in the middle range whose responses indicated indecision, indifference, or conditionality (those whose means ranged narrowly around 3.00). We arbitrarily decided that all principals with mean responses across all items comprising the self-expectations score ranging between 3.00 and 3.25 inclusive would be called positively disposed and that only these would be retained for the analysis of data (see Table 3-1).⁴

Since all principals now included in the sample held only positive self-expectations, the frequency of their behavior patterns in each of the three areas represented an index of conformity to those expectations. The extent of that conformity, we argue, is associated both with organizational conditions and with characteristics of the principal himself.

The analysis of data, then, takes the following form: within this sample of positively disposed principals, divided according to school level, we calculate the Pearsonian correlation coefficient between an independent variable and a measure of the principal's actual behavior. If, for example, we hypothesize that school size is one condition that can affect the extent of conformity to self-expectation to support

Table 5-1. The Percentage of Principals with Positive Self-Expectations for Closeness of Supervision, Support of Innovation, and Involvement of Parents in School Affairs, by School Level

	Closeness of Supervision			Support of Innovation			Involvement of Parents		
	All Cases ¹	Positive Cases ²	Per Cent Positive Cases	All Cases ¹	Positive Cases ²	Per Cent Positive Cases	All Cases ¹	Positive Cases ²	Per Cent Positive Cases
Elementary	175	158	90.3	175	167	95.4	175	105	60.0
Junior High	135	125	92.6	135	119	88.1	135	57	42.2
Senior High	144	119	82.6	144	137	95.1	143	79	55.2
Total	454	402	88.5	454	423	93.2	453	241	53.2
Total Loss	52			31			212		

¹ All cases in the sample for which there is data on principal self-expectation.

² Cases with mean self-expectation scores ranging from 5.00 to 3.25 inclusive.

innovation, we calculate the correlation between size and our behavioral measure of support of innovation among principals at each school level. The analysis, then, involves the use of four variables simultaneously, only three of which appear in the tables: (1) school size (independent); (2) support of innovation behavior (dependent); (3) school level (conditional); and (4) self-expectation to support innovation (conditional, but not appearing since the sample of principals used in this analysis is restricted to those positively disposed). The correlation coefficient then represents the index of conformity.

The central argument underlying our analysis is based on the assumptions that principals bring to their positions a conception of how they should act in their capacity as school executives, that they feel a sense of self-imposed obligation to act in accord with this conception, and anticipate both personal gratification and a sense of accomplishment in moving the school as an organization in a desired direction. However, in making the decision to act, principals, we further assume, anticipate the risks involved in acting according to their self-expectations; that is, they weigh the potential benefits to their organizations and to themselves should they act according to personal conviction against the possible costs of such action. The intensity of risk is calculated in terms of the negative consequences affecting the crucial relationships between the principals themselves and other persons vitally concerned with the operation of the schools: members of the higher administration of the school system, teachers, pupils, and parents.

In the following three chapters we attempt to account for variations in the extent to which principals conform to their self-expectations in three areas of role behavior: closeness of supervision, support of innovation, and involvement of parents in school affairs. In each area, we have limited the sample of principals to those holding favorable sentiments toward the behavior in question.

Notes and References for Chapter Five

1. It deserves note that there are at least two possible interpretations for analytic purposes of the "may or may not" response category: first, it can be thought of as a midpoint between the positive and negative poles; second, it can be treated as a lack of expectation. We chose the second alternative in carrying out the analysis.

2. Note that in the case of parental involvement, most of the principals eliminated from the sample were those falling in the middle response range, not those opposed.

3. In the area of supervision, for example, a principal's score was based on his responses to eight questions each of which was weighted according to its factor loading.

4. We restricted the sample in this way for each of the three variables under consideration: principals' self-expectations pertaining to supervision, innovation, and parental involvement. The cases falling within the 5.00 to 3.25 range of item means were not necessarily the same for the three variables.

Chapter 6: Closeness of Supervision

We address ourselves here to the problem of identifying the conditions under which principals who believe that they ought to supervise their teachers closely actually do so. In this, and in the following two chapters, we shall try to identify: (1) the sources of risk confronting the principal as he contemplates acting in accordance with expectations he holds for himself; (2) the conditions in his work environment and the personal resources at his disposal for reducing or overcoming risk. In so doing, we pay particular attention to those persons who are directly affected by his actions: teachers, higher administrators, and the principal himself, as well as to the organizational properties of schools.

Earlier we maintained that one of the most important characteristics of schools is their level: elementary, junior high, and senior high. In sociological perspective, schools at the three levels differ markedly in their structural characteristics. In consequence, we shall take school level into account in each of our analyses to determine whether it has any influence on the relationship to be examined.¹

Teacher Characteristics

Although supervisory activities have implications for many aspects of school organization, they have their most immediate impact on teachers. We turn first to the question of whether teacher characteristics are relevant to the conformity of principals to their self-expectations.

Teacher Expectations

A principal must supervise members of his staff to some extent for a variety of reasons, among which are that: he is held responsible by his superiors for the overall operation of his school, he needs to know whether his own policies are being carried out, and he must judge the quality of performance of his teachers.

What is desirable from the principals' perspective is not necessarily so from the teachers' since they occupy different positions within the school and have somewhat different interests and problems. One aspect of the teachers' work has special relevance to whether the principal can act according to his own desire to supervise; namely, professional autonomy.

There is a long tradition among teachers honoring the sanctity of the classroom. In addition, teachers are professional workers in the sense that they receive advanced academic training and undergo a supervised apprenticeship in order to gain both technical proficiency and the ability to make independent judgments in the course of their classroom activities. Close supervision by a principal, therefore, might well be viewed by his teachers as an infringement upon their professional domain. If this is the case, the more closely the principal supervises, the more he is also likely to create resentment among members of his faculty as a consequence of the infringement and thereby increase the risks in carrying out his own work.

If, however, his teachers desire and expect him to supervise -- as they might in order to gain help and recognition for the work they do --

the potential risks to the principal are mitigated in that by acting according to his self-expectations he also acts in conformity to those of his teachers.

On the basis of the reasoning presented above, we hypothesize that the more strongly teachers expect the principal to supervise them closely, the more likely he will conform to his own expectation to do so.

We described earlier (Chapter Three, pp. 3-19 -- 3-21) the way we measured the principals' behavior on closeness of supervision. To obtain the best estimate of teacher expectations for their principal in this respect, we obtained the mean of the Teacher Expectation Scores for each school.² It is clear from Table 6-1 that our hypothesis receives empirical support at each school level.

Teacher Competence

We based the preceding argument on the assumption of the teachers' desire for professional autonomy. We consider here another aspect of their professionalism: technical competence.

If teachers are competent, this implies that they can cope successfully with the problems arising in the classroom by using their own skills and resources. Under these circumstances, the more closely the principal supervises, the greater the risk he runs of arousing staff resentment.

According to this line of argument, we hypothesize that the larger the proportion of competent teachers on the staff, the less closely the principal will supervise. He reduces the potential risks -- creating resentment by watching over professional subordinates -- by supervising

Table 6-1. The Relationship between Teacher Expectations for Closeness of Supervision and Principals' Conformity to Self-Expectations in This Area, by School Level
(Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	<u>r</u>	N
Elementary	.51*	152
Junior High	.40*	122
Senior High	.45*	115

* $p < .05$; one-tailed test.

to a minimal extent.

The question of how to judge the ability of a teacher has not been answered satisfactorily, yet judgments about competence are made all the time since teachers are hired, fired, and promoted. Since there are no clearcut criteria of competence available, we have proceeded in very much the same way that school boards and their administrative subordinates have; namely, by using plausible indices.

To determine whether teacher competence is related to the extent to which principals supervise as closely as they believe they should, we have measured competence in two distinct ways: first, in terms of academic credentials (the per cent of teachers in each school holding the Master's or some higher degree); and second, each principal's subjective estimate of the per cent of his teachers who "competently carry out their teaching assignments." The choice of these two indices was not arbitrary. In the first case, whether or not academic preparation is in fact a good index of competence, it is nevertheless one criterion used by school systems in hiring teachers and in determining their salaries. In the second case, whether or not the principal's estimate is accurate, his personal assessment is likely to constitute at least one consideration governing his actions; that is, there are probably certain tasks he will undertake on a school-wide basis if he feels his staff is strong that he would not undertake if he lacked confidence in the members' abilities.

We obtained our two measures of teacher competence in the following ways. (1) Academic credentials: on the mailed Principal Questionnaire,

we asked each principal to report the number of teachers on his staff holding each academic degree. On the basis of these reports, we calculated the percentage of teachers in each school holding the Master's or higher degree (Table 6-2). (2) Principal's Assessment of Teacher Competence: during the course of the principals' interviews, we asked each principal the following question: "What per cent of your teachers competently carry out their teaching assignments?" (Table 6-3.)

The findings in general do not support our hypothesis (Table 6-4). Specifically, in regard to academic preparation, they are in direct contradiction to it at both the elementary and junior high levels. At the senior high level, the correlation is in the predicted direction; it approaches but does not reach the .05 level of significance. In regard to the principals' estimates of staff competence, there is confirmation only at the senior high level, but no relationship at either the elementary or the junior high levels.

While our findings at the senior high level are consistent with the line of reasoning underlying our hypothesis, the professional autonomy argument, those at the elementary and junior high levels are not; why not?

Our original formulation ignored an important difference among the three levels of schools: namely, that they vary in the proportion of teachers holding the Master's degree, as indicated in Table 6-2. In the elementary schools only a small minority of teachers typically hold the Master's degree; thus when we speak of an increasing proportion of such academically trained teachers, we are in effect referring to a growing

Table 6-2. Per Cent of Teachers in Elementary, Junior High, and Senior High Schools Holding a Master's or Higher Academic Degree as Reported by Principals, by School Level

Per Cent of Staff with MA or Higher Degree	Elementary		Junior High		Senior High	
	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent
0 - 9	48	25.8	9	6.1	1	0.6
10 - 19	44	23.7	24	16.3	6	3.7
20 - 29	49	26.3	22	15.0	21	13.1
30 - 39	21	11.3	32	21.8	25	15.5
40 - 49	13	7.0	29	19.7	35	21.8
50 - 59	7	3.7	12	8.2	27	16.7
60 - 69	3	1.6	11	7.5	14	8.7
70 - 79	-	-	6	4.0	13	8.1
80 - 89	1	0.5	2	1.4	12	7.4
90 - 99	-	-	-	-	7	4.4
Total	186	99.9	147	100.0	161	100.0

Table 6-3. Principals' Responses to the Question: "What Per Cent of Your Teachers Competently Carry Out Their Teaching Assignments?" by School Level

Per Cent of Teachers Judged Competent	Elementary		Junior High		Senior High	
	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent
0 - 49	3	1.6	1	0.7	3	1.9
50 - 59	4	2.2	4	2.7	4	2.5
60 - 69	4	2.2	3	2.0	3	1.9
70 - 79	17	9.1	17	11.5	13	8.2
80 - 89	35	18.8	37	25.0	37	23.3
90 - 99	123	66.1	86	58.1	99	62.3
Total	186	100.0	148	100.0	159	100.1

Table 6-4. The Relationship between Two Measures of Teacher Competence and Principals' Conformity to Self-Expectations to Supervise Closely, by School Level (Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

A. Percentage of teachers on the staff holding the Master's or higher academic degree.

	<u>r</u>	N
Elementary	.22**	158
Junior High	.25**	122
Senior High	-.14	118

B. Principals' estimates of the percentage of teachers on the staff who competently carry out their teaching assignments.

	<u>r</u>	N
Elementary	.00	156
Junior High	-.07	123
Senior High	-.24*	116

* $p < .05$; one-tailed test.

** $p < .05$; two-tailed test.

elite minority in an organizational setting where the vast majority of teachers have lower academic credentials. This means, in such a setting, that as the proportion of a principal's staff with advanced degrees gets larger more of his teachers have the same academic credentials as he (89 per cent of elementary school principals hold the Master's degree) and thus can fulfill his functions in helping weaker teachers. This condition could constitute a threat to the principal's leadership. However, these highly trained teachers are not obliged to carry out the evaluative function that a principal must exercise by virtue of his administrative position in the school. Our elementary school findings suggest, in short, that the principal may cope with the risks inherent in this threat by supervising his teachers closely in order that his teachers do not gravitate to their better trained colleagues rather than to him. He, after all, is the one held accountable for the operation of the total school.

At the junior high level, our findings again appear interpretable in terms of context. Junior high schools are often "difficult" schools to teach in. The pupils are at ages that are often the stormiest of adolescence; they must decide whether to enter the college preparatory curriculum (one of the most fateful ones in their lives), and a considerable number of them are approaching the age when they can legally leave school but must endure the frustrations of staying in school after they have concluded that school is not for them.

For teachers with advanced training in subject matter areas, the junior high school is not always a hospitable atmosphere for teaching what they know. The pupils can be too young, discipline problems in vogue,

and the school sufficiently non-departmentalized with the result that teachers can be called on to instruct in areas in which they have little preparation and little interest. If these contentions are true, it is predictable that the more highly trained junior high school teachers consider their jobs as temporary sojourns; they apply for transfer and wait for a high school post to open up.

This suggests that a source of risk for the principal of a junior high school lies in the potential instability of his teaching staff. The more highly trained teachers there are on the faculty, the more likely these teachers will have a tenuous commitment to remain in the school. Under these circumstances, the principal can reduce his risks by supervising closely since supervision represents one way of controlling an organization with a potential for high turnover.

In essence, then, our findings suggest that the amount of academic training of teachers is not simply an index of their competence as we originally assumed. Although ability is likely to be one component of competence related to the likelihood that the principal will act according to his self-expectations, an advanced academic degree may have different meanings depending on the properties of the organizational context under consideration.

In regard to the principal's estimate of the proportion of competent teachers in his school, we also found no relationship between that proportion and the principal's conformity to self-expectations at the elementary and junior high levels. In this case, in contrast to academic preparation, the measure of competence is not related to school level

(Table 6-3). We would suggest that the findings might be explained as follows: if the principal is competent but his teachers on the average are not, he would tend to conform to his own disposition to supervise; supervising in this case represents one means of diminishing his risks. If, however, the principal felt that his staff was competent but that he himself was not,³ relatively speaking, he would tend to reduce the risks in his work by not closely supervising them.

Teacher Loyalty to the Principal

If, as we have argued, the risks of supervision derive in part from the unsettling effects the principal's actions may have on teachers, then the nature of the teachers' relationship to the principal should be a matter of considerable importance. One aspect of this relationship is the personal loyalty of the staff to the principal. We contend that the personal loyalty of teachers to their principal represents for him a bank of good will.⁴ That is, their loyalty constitutes one of the principal's resources for reducing the intensity of the risks involved in supervisory activities. Thus, we hypothesize that the more he can count on the personal allegiance of his faculty, the more likely he will be able to supervise closely (in conformity to his own expectations to do so).

To test this hypothesis, we required an index of teacher loyalty to their principal. Such a measure was developed from the responses of teachers in each school to the following questions: "Of the teachers in your school, what per cent:"

1. Support the principal when he is being criticized by elements in the community.
2. Would stand behind the principal if he were unfairly criticized by a group of parents.
3. Have a sense of personal loyalty to the principal.
4. Support the principal when he is under pressure from the higher administration of the school system.⁵

The teachers' responses to these questions were averaged for each school and then intercorrelated. The correlation matrix revealed that these summary measures of teachers' responses were highly correlated and that a single dimension might be extracted as an index of loyalty. Therefore, the average scores were subjected to a principal components factor analysis. By use of the resulting factor weights, a factor score was computed for teacher loyalty for each school.⁶

The findings indicate support for our hypothesis at the junior and senior high school levels, but not at the elementary (Table 6-5). As indicated in the preceding section of this chapter, secondary school teachers (especially those in the high schools), tend to be highly specialized in terms of their command of subject matter; by implication, the principal can find himself at a considerable disadvantage in supervisory situations where the teacher, even though hierarchically subordinate, may know more than he does. Under these circumstances, if the principal supervises closely, as he believes he should, he will need some legitimate basis for doing so other than a claim to competence. Having the personal allegiance of his teachers represents one resource for

Table 6-5. The Relationship between Teacher Loyalty to Principals and Their Conformity to Self-Expectations to Supervise Closely, by School Level (Personian Correlation Coefficients)

	<u>r</u>	N
Elementary	.06	150
Junior High	.23*	111
Senior High	.32*	116

* $p < .05$; one-tailed test.

reducing the risks inherent in a potentially disruptive activity such as supervising specialized subordinates.

At the elementary level, a different situation between principal and faculty obtains. Teachers are less specialized in that they are all called upon to engage in a wide variety of classroom activities and to be generalists in the imparting of cognitive skills and subject matter. Principals at this level have by and large come up through the elementary teaching ranks -- this is especially true of women principals -- and have considerable command of the broad range of skills in teaching and classroom management (unlike their high school counterparts). Under these circumstances, principals can justify their supervisory activities on the bases of both hierarchy and competence. That is to say, the elementary principal who has greater mastery of classroom skills than many teachers faces fewer risks than the secondary school principal; the teachers' loyalty, therefore, is not as necessary a resource since the principal is not confronted by the risks inherent in situations where there are contradictory bases of authority and where principals and teachers have different competencies. It is for this reason, we suggest, that loyalty is not as crucial a factor at the elementary level as at the secondary.⁷

Teacher Satisfaction with the Principal's Leadership

As with loyalty, a principal whose teachers are satisfied with the way he runs the school can also draw upon a bank of good will. In this case, however, the principal's available resource for reducing risk is based not on allegiance to him personally but on the teachers' satisfaction

with what he does, that is, the way he runs the school.

The hypothesis to be tested is that the greater the teachers' satisfaction with the principal's leadership, the more frequently the principal would act according to his own expectations to exercise close supervision over his staff.

Our measure of satisfaction is based on teacher responses in each school to the following questionnaire items: "How do you feel about:"

1. The extent to which I am informed by my superiors about school matters affecting me.
2. The manner in which the teachers and the administrative staff work together in this school.
3. The method employed in this school for making decisions on pupil discipline matters.
4. The cooperation and help which I receive from my superiors.
5. The educational philosophy which seems to prevail in this school.
6. The method employed in this school for making decisions on curriculum matters.

They expressed their degree of satisfaction on a six-point scale ranging from 'very satisfied' to 'very dissatisfied,' with the intermediate points being 'moderately' and 'slightly.' A Guttman scale with a coefficient of reproducibility of .948 was developed from their responses to these items.⁸

When we correlated the teacher satisfaction scores with the principals'

conformity to their self-expectation to supervise closely, we found support for the hypothesis at each school level (Table 6-6).

Higher Administrator Characteristics

Even though teachers are most directly affected by the supervisory activities of principals, there are aspects of these activities that pertain to the principals' relationships to their administrative superiors and that may bear on the risks principals will encounter in attempting to conform to their self-expectations.

Higher Administrator Expectations

Because principals and higher administrators occupy different positions in the school system, there is a distinct possibility that their perspectives on school operation differ. For example, while a given principal is responsible for the operation of his particular school, his administrative superior is responsible for a jurisdiction containing that principal's school along with many others. When two individuals are concerned about the same social organization but where their perspectives grow out of the differences in their respective job responsibilities, there is a potentiality for conflict and risks for both parties.

There is more than conflict over perspective involved, however. Since school systems provide the main line of career development for principals, their superordinates have a considerable amount to say about who gets promoted or passed over. To the extent that principals are dependent upon the good offices of their superiors for promotion, deviating

Table 6-6. The Relationship between Teacher Satisfaction with Principals' Leadership and Their Conformity to Self-Expectations to Supervise Closely, by School Level (Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	<u>r</u>	N
Elementary	.33*	158
Junior High	.30*	125
Senior High	.38*	119

* $p < .05$; one-tailed test.

too far from higher administrative policies and failing to conform to the expectations of superiors can involve considerable risk for the principals. Even in cases where principals are not interested in advancement, their superiors can affect their work very directly by easing or restricting the flow of resources to particular schools and by being more or less responsive to their needs and problems.

In the event that the principal's self-expectations and those of his immediate superior coincide, the principal has some assurance that his actions are consistent with system-wide policies and that there will be little justification for the higher administrator to exercise the sanctions at his disposal. The fact that higher administrative expectations coincide with those of the principal represents in itself a risk reducing element in the principal's work situation. Thus, we hypothesize that the more strongly a higher administrator expects a principal to engage in close supervisory activities, the more likely is the principal to conform to his own expectations by supervising closely.

The measure of higher administrator expectations was derived from the responses of higher administrators to the same questions contained in the Principal's Self-expectations Questionnaire and the weights for each of those questions based on the factor analysis of principals' responses to that questionnaire. The principals' role performance scores were then correlated with the expectations score of their higher administrators to determine whether our hypothesis receives empirical support.

The findings offer support for our hypothesis only at the elementary school level (Table 6-7). There are several possible explanations of the

Table 6-7. The Relationship between Higher Administrator Expectations for Closeness of Supervision and Principals' Conformity to Self-Expectations in This Area, by School Level (Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	<u>r</u>	N
Elementary	.28*	155
Junior High	.03	124
Senior High	.12	116

* $p < .05$; one-tailed test.

results. First, in regard to the 'career advancement' argument: the findings suggest that it is relevant only for elementary principals -- most likely for the men -- and not for their secondary school counterparts. The elementary principalship is lower on the administrative ladder than the other two, and to the extent that a principal wants occupational mobility within or without the school system, his immediate superior, by virtue of the position he occupies, can have much to say about his chances.

At the secondary levels, and particularly in the high schools, many principals already occupy the highest position they will attain because of their age and/or the objective realization that there are relatively few higher administrative posts to be filled and because there is a large pool of prospective candidates from which to draw in filling them. Where the principals' opportunities for further advancement are limited, then, higher administrators may have less influence on the principals' opportunity for mobility. By implication, secondary school principals who conform to their self-expectations but not to those of their higher administrators do not necessarily jeopardize their career opportunities as much as their elementary counterparts. Less is at stake, and hence the risks are smaller.

In addition, there are differences in principals' power and prestige in the system that are related to school level. Even though there are no formally acknowledged status distinctions between elementary and secondary school positions, there is, nevertheless, a widely recognized distinction; the secondary school principal, particularly at the high

school level, tends to have higher prestige and power, probably because he usually heads a larger and more complex organization. If this contention is correct, one would expect secondary school principals to be in a less vulnerable, less risky situation vis-à-vis the higher administration than their lower level counterparts. Among the latter, conforming to higher administrators' expectations similar to their own provides a relatively potent risk-reducing resource; for secondary school principals with considerable power and prestige of their own, this risk-reducing mechanism is probably of less importance.

Principal Participation in Staff Recruitment

The procedures for hiring new teachers in school systems are often highly controversial in that principals usually want much more say about who is selected to work in their schools than they have. In all systems, the school board formally hires personnel but who recruits and who influences the assignment of teachers to particular schools varies. For example, in some systems the whole recruitment and assignment process is assumed by the higher administration, and new teachers are sent to schools without the principal having anything to say about who is to work for him; in others, principals actively recruit -- or raid, as the case may be -- and submit names to the higher administration for rubber-stamp approval.

Gaining full cooperation from subordinates is potentially problematic in any organizational setting, especially where the membership may have diverse social and personal characteristics. In addition, supervisory activities themselves are likely to affect people differently

depending on their experience, training, self-confidence, and so on; the principal, for example, who reviews lesson plans might help one teacher and affront another. The principal who acts in accord with his self-defined obligation to supervise closely may create both positive and deleterious conditions by engaging in the same set of activities with different teachers. It is our contention that the more frequently he is able to participate in the recruitment process, the greater the chance he would have to select teachers who were personally compatible to him and to other members of the faculty, and who would thus be more willing to accept his supervision. By so doing, he would be able to reduce the risks inherent in close supervision. We thus hypothesize that the more principals participate in teacher recruitment, the greater their conformity to their self-expectation to supervise closely.

Our measure of the principals' participation in recruitment procedures was obtained from their responses to a question about the frequency with which the higher administration made it possible for them to evaluate applicants for teaching posts within their schools. The distribution of their replies to this question is presented in Table 6-8.

The findings show that there is no relationship at any level between the extent to which principals participate in teacher recruitment and the frequency with which they conform to their own expectations to supervise (Table 6-9). One possible interpretation of the findings is that principals may not be able to learn enough about prospective teachers when they evaluate them to judge with sufficient certainty that they will turn out to be compatible staff members. A second is that there may not

Table 6-8. Distribution of Principals' Responses to the Question: "To What Extent Does the Higher Administration in Your School System Allow a Principal to Evaluate Teaching Applicants Who Are Being Considered for Appointment to His School," by School Level

Response Choices	Elementary		Junior High		Senior High	
	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent
Always	18	10.2	21	14.8	38	24.1
Almost Always	37	20.9	46	32.4	36	22.8
Occasionally	40	22.6	33	23.2	46	29.1
Almost Never	43	24.3	28	19.7	26	16.5
Never	39	22.0	14	9.9	12	7.6
Total	177	100.0	142	100.0	158	100.1

Table 6-9. The Relationship between the Extent Principals Are Allowed by the Higher Administration to Evaluate Teaching Applicants Being Considered for Appointment to Their Schools and Principals' Conformity to Self-Expectations to Supervise: Closely, by School Level (Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	<u>r</u>	N
Elementary	.04	148
Junior High	.05	117
Senior High	.07	115

be a large enough number of new recruits at any one time to influence the social composition of the whole staff so that the members will welcome or at least not resist supervision. Both of these interpretations suggest that the reasoning underlying the hypothesis was mistaken.

Principal Characteristics

Now we turn to characteristics of the man himself that may influence the extent to which he acts according to self-expectations. We shall argue that certain characteristics and actions of the principal himself represent conditions bearing on his conformity to self-expectations.

Principal Self-expectations

One characteristic that may influence the extent to which a principal conforms to his self-expectations is the intensity of his own convictions. Although we have limited our sample of principals to those who feel they ought to supervise their teachers closely, it actually includes individuals with varying degrees of positive sentiment toward closeness of supervision.

The variation in positive self-expectations within this range reflects how intense that positive sentiment is; in other words, how much the self-expectations represent an overriding concern. We assume that the greater the overriding concern the more likely the principal will conform to his self-expectations in spite of the risks involved. Strength of conviction, therefore, is not a means to reduce risk but rather to

accept the prevailing risks and act anyway. We, therefore, hypothesize that the more intense the principal's belief that he should supervise closely, the more he will conform to his self-expectation.

To measure the degree of intensity of the principal's self-expectation, we used his self-expectation score, the measurement of which was described in Chapter Three.

As Table 6-10 indicates, the findings at all school levels were in the predicted direction and were significant statistically at the elementary and senior high levels. At the junior high level, the size of the correlation coefficient approaches, but does not quite reach, the .05 level of statistical significance.

Sharing of Responsibility with Teachers

There has been much written about the administration of schools and school systems according to democratic principles. By no stretch of the imagination, however, can a school be understood as a democratic polity analogous to certain Western nations.⁹ It is true, of course, that most organizations -- save for the most coercive and brutal and even about these there is some controversy -- depend on the willing cooperation and contribution of subordinates and make some arrangement, however minimal, for the participation of lower echelon members in decisions that affect them. This type of participation is not uniquely democratic -- it occurs even in totalitarian states -- although in democratic polities, rank and file or citizenship participation is encouraged and protected more than in other types of political systems. A fundamental misconception that has plagued the literature on school administration is that a certain

Table 6-10. The Relationship between Principal Self-Expectations to Supervise Closely and Conformity to Them, by School Level (Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	r	N
Elementary	.26*	156
Junior High	.14	124
Senior High	.38*	119

* $p < .05$; one-tailed test.

degree of staff participation in policy making in general or in certain specific areas is equivalent to democracy.

We are concerned here with the extent that principals share responsibility with members of the teaching staff for making decisions, not because such sharing is "democratic" but because this represents one way among alternatives that a principal can do his work in the manner that he thinks he should.¹⁰

Two lines of argument are involved in our hypothesis about the relationship between the principal's sharing responsibility with teachers and the extent to which he conforms to his own supervisory expectations. First, if he shares responsibility, he can create the feeling among them that they are actually involved in the decision-making process; he is under no legal or contractual mandate to involve them, yet by doing so and taking their views into account he creates a situation in which they are more likely to be tolerant of his supervisory activities and hence reduce the risks of close supervision.

Second, in the very process of sharing responsibility, the principal opens up a channel for communication; he creates an opportunity for clarifying misunderstandings and ambiguities, for determining what the conflicting interests are, for explaining the reasons for his actions, and for giving teachers a forum to air their complaints and resentments. These latter functions of sharing responsibility, we contend, also mitigate the risks of supervisory activity. Thus, we hypothesize that the more the principal shares responsibility for making decisions with his staff, the more likely he will be able to conform to his self-expectation to supervise closely.

Sharing responsibility is a concept with several dimensions: responsibility can be shared on trivial or important matters; frequently or infrequently; and in few areas or in many. In developing a measure for the concept, we were concerned with a general pattern of the principal's behavior (one that included several facets of his job) and one that was concerned with issues central to the operation of the school. In terms of measurement, the teachers' reports of how frequently the principal enlisted their participation appeared to be the most appropriate index. The teachers' responses to four questions about the staff's involvement in the principal's decision making comprise the data for testing the hypothesis. They were asked to report the extent to which (always, almost always, occasionally, almost never, and never) their principal:

1. Share with teachers the responsibility for determining the minimum level of satisfactory student performance in your school.
2. Share with teachers the responsibility for evaluating how good a job the school is doing.
3. Share with teachers the responsibility for determining how teachers should be evaluated.
4. Share with teachers the responsibility for developing a policy for handling student discipline problems.

The principal's staff involvement score for each area was defined as the average of the reports of the teachers in each school. These scores were then correlated with his closeness of supervision score.

The results confirm our hypothesis in each area except in the one concerned

with sharing responsibility in the area of teacher evaluation (Table 6-11). Even though these four areas are of concern both to teachers and principals, the one dealing with evaluation is an especially touchy area and could, in some cases, lead to conflicts among teachers and in others to their reduction. If this supposition is reasonable, the lack of relationship in this area could be explained by cancellation effects.

Principals' Skills: Instruction and Human Relations

Investigators who have studied a variety of group and organizational settings have discovered quite independently two dimensions of leadership occurring in social systems.¹¹ The first refers to a type of leadership directed at getting a job done; the second to a type directed at dealing with social and emotional issues arising among people working collectively at a task.

One basic component of the principal's job is directing the instructional program: putting the resources of the faculty to good use, knowing where particular talents lie and how to put them to work, defining the content of the school program so that faculty members know where they should be investing their time and energy and where not, and aiding their teachers. If teachers acknowledge the principal's competence in these activities and respect him for his ability, then, we contend, the risks he faces in supervising are reduced because his teachers acknowledge that he knows what he is doing.

A second component of his work consists of his dealings with people. His job requires that he consider the interests of a variety of persons all of whom have a stake in what happens in school but who view the

Table 6-11. The Relationship between the Involvement of Teachers in Four Decision Areas and Principals' Conformity to Self-Expectations to Supervise Closely, by School Level (Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	<u>r</u>	<u>N</u>
<u>Pupil Performance</u>		
Elementary	.42*	158
Junior High	.46*	125
Senior High	.40*	119
<u>School Evaluation</u>		
Elementary	.34*	158
Junior High	.41*	125
Senior High	.32*	119
<u>Teacher Evaluation</u>		
Elementary	.04	158
Junior High	.11	125
Senior High	.10	119
<u>Discipline Policy</u>		
Elementary	.34*	158
Junior High	.33*	125
Senior High	.39*	119

* $p < .05$; one-tailed test.

school from very different perspectives. Not only does he mediate between conflicting interests, he must get people to work together, soothe hurt feelings, ask for extra effort, cope with criticism -- all skills requiring sophistication in understanding and dealing with the social and emotional problems that arise in a work environment. We argue, then, that aside from his skills in instructional matters, the principal who has won the respect of his teachers because he can cope with the difficulties arising among people will confront less risk in his supervisory activities. Thus, we hypothesize first that the more highly teachers rate the principal's skills in matters of instruction and second in human relations, the more he will conform to his own expectations to supervise closely.

Our measure of the teachers' evaluation of their principal's performance in instructional leadership was based on their responses to the following eight questions: "How well (outstanding, excellent, good, fair, poor, and very poor) do you feel your principal does the following?"

1. Getting experienced teachers to upgrade their performance.
2. Improving the performance of inexperienced teachers.
3. Getting teachers to use new educational methods.
4. Giving leadership to the instructional program.
5. Communicating the objectives of the school program to the faculty.
6. Getting teachers to coordinate their activities.
7. Knowing about the strengths and weaknesses of teachers.
8. Maximizing the different skills found in a faculty.

These items were selected on the basis of a factor analysis of 23 questions dealing with various facets of the principal's performance.¹²

The procedure we used to obtain the teachers' evaluation of how their principal performed in the area of instructional leadership was as follows: first, on the basis of the teachers' responses to the eight questions, a score for each teacher was computed based on the weights derived from the loadings of items included in the factor.¹³ The scores of teachers in each school were then averaged to obtain the best estimate of the evaluation of the principal's performance in instructional leadership. A similar procedure was used to obtain the measure of the teachers' evaluation of the principal's human relations skills. The items in this area were as follows:

1. Resolving student discipline problems.
2. Handling parental complaints.
3. Handling delicate interpersonal situations.
4. Obtaining parental cooperation with the school.
5. Developing "esprit de corps" among teachers.¹⁴

As the results indicate in Table 6-12, our hypotheses are supported with respect to both skills at each school level.

Organizational Properties of Schools

Although the persons who occupy different positions in the principal's work setting represent possible sources of risk to him, or resources by which he can reduce that risk in order to engage in the activities he feels obligated to perform, these persons do not constitute the

Table 6-12. The Relationship between Teacher Evaluation of Principals' Skills in the Areas of (A) Instructional Leadership; (B) Human Relations and Their Conformity to Self-Expectations to Supervise Closely, by School Level (Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	<u>r</u>	<u>N</u>
A. <u>Instructional Leadership</u>		
Elementary	.47*	158
Junior High	.53*	125
Senior High	.54*	119
B. <u>Human Relations</u>		
Elementary	.24*	158
Junior High	.27*	125
Senior High	.24*	119

* $p < .05$; one-tailed test.

totality of his environment. The school itself, considering its organizational properties independently from the characteristics of individuals who participate in and around it, constitutes another important sector of that environment.

At several earlier points in this chapter we have interpreted findings on the basis of school characteristics; we have referred, for example, to departmentalization which tells us something about the school itself apart from the individuals connected with it. Principals, whatever their self-expectations happen to be for a given pattern of behavior, work in schools that differ in other respects in addition to degree of departmentalization. Two of these, we reasoned, would be of special relevance to the risks they would confront in acting in the way they believe they should: school size and the age variation among their staffs.

School Size

Table 6-13 reveals the widely known fact that schools at different levels vary markedly in size as indexed by student enrollment. It also indicates that there is considerable size variation within school levels. We are concerned here with school size as it pertains to the risks confronted by principals in their supervisory activities; there are several apposite arguments.

First, school size has implications for the allocation of the principal's time. The more teachers there are to supervise, and to the extent that supervision requires time that could be spent on equally or more pressing concerns, the more the principal will either have to spread himself thin or neglect other important responsibilities. By

Table 6-13. School Size: The Mean, Number, and Range of Pupils Enrolled, by School Level

	Mean	Range	S.D.	Number
Elementary	705.7	166 to 3932	380.8	189
Junior High	1194.9	262 to 5500	538.1	150
Senior High	1773.6	444 to 5091	810.0	162

implication, therefore, the magnitude of risk increases; and it becomes more difficult for him to supervise according to his self-imposed obligation. On the basis of this line of reasoning we hypothesize that the larger the school, the less the principal will conform to his self-expectation to supervise closely.

It is clear from Table 6-14 that our hypothesis is not supported at any school level and that our reasoning was apparently in error. The fault in it may be due to our ignoring the possibility that the greater the size of the school the larger the principal's administrative staff and hence the greater his opportunity to delegate his non-supervisory tasks.

Variance in Teacher Age

A person's age is an individual characteristic; in an organizational setting, however, the ages of members can be aggregated and considered as an organizational characteristic. There are various ways of summarizing such characteristics, and organizations can be compared according to these summaries (for example, according to age composition, mean age, or age dispersion). In regard to supervisory behavior, the last of these three summaries is particularly germane.

People's interests often vary according to how old they are; this is a general proposition. In particular settings, such as schools, age may have a variety of meanings. For example, younger teachers may need more help and support than older, more experienced ones; at the same time, they may be more energetic, less cynical, more likely to try out new ideas, more inclined to move from one school to another. Older

Table 6-14. The Relationship between School Size (Number of Pupils) and Principals' Conformity to Self-Expectations to Supervise Closely, by School Level (Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	<u>r</u>	N
Elementary	-.12	158
Junior High	-.00	125
Senior High	-.11	119

teachers may have less interest in advancing in their careers, be better able to distinguish new ideas worth trying from tenuous schemes, more likely to feel that they have some claim to deference and special considerations, and more inclined to feel that principals should heed their counsel. If these contentions are correct, the supervisory activities of the principal are likely to affect teachers differently according to how old they are.

If we classify schools as to their dispersion on teacher age, we thereby characterize them according to the variety of interests a principal must take into account prior to engaging in supervisory activities. The greater the number of distinct interests the principal must take into account, the less likely he will be able to satisfy all the individuals whose interests are represented in the staff, for example, close supervision will mean one thing to a highly competent, experienced teacher and something else to one fresh out of school and green. Thus, the greater the variance in teacher age, the greater the risks that confront the principal who supervises closely. We thus hypothesize that variation in teacher age is negatively related to a principal's conformity to his self-expectation to supervise closely.

To measure variation in teacher age, we computed the variance of the age distribution of teachers within each school, a statistic that allows us to compare schools on whether teachers of many different ages are represented on a given faculty or whether their ages tend to cluster narrowly around a given point (Table 6-15). The results as shown in Table 6-16 do not support our contention at any school level. There are

Table 6-15. The Percentage Distribution of the Variance of Teacher Age in 489* Schools, by School Level

Variance of Teacher Age	Elementary		Junior High		Senior High	
	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent
0.00 - 0.49	3	1.6	2	1.4	-	-
0.50 - 0.99	12	6.4	5	3.4	6	3.8
1.00 - 1.49	24	12.8	25	17.1	21	13.5
1.50 - 1.99	44	23.5	33	22.6	35	22.4
2.00 - 2.49	44	23.5	45	30.8	40	25.6
2.50 - 2.99	31	16.6	23	15.8	30	20.5
3.00 - 3.49	19	10.2	7	4.8	18	11.5
3.50 +	10	5.3	6	4.1	4	2.6
Total	187	99.9	146	100.0	156	99.9

* Twelve principals did not supply sufficient information about the age distribution of their staffs.

Table 6-16. The Relationship between Variance in Teacher Age and Principals' Conformity to Self-Expectations to Supervise Closely, by School Level (Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	<u>r</u>	N
Elementary	-.09	157
Junior High	-.03	121
Senior High	-.08	114

several interpretations to account for the failure of the expected inverse relationship to appear. First, our argument was premised on the assumption that supervision was a relatively public activity in which those involved could easily observe and compare the amount of supervision received by each staff member with the possibility that inequities could become widely recognized. In fact, however, the internal arrangement of schools provides opportunities for the principal to supervise teachers in privacy. Not only does the self-contained classroom make this possible -- principals can observe each teacher in a setting outside the purview of his colleagues -- but the scheduling of teaching makes it possible for principals to talk with individual teachers alone, after hours or during free periods. Both the spatial and temporal aspects of teaching activities thus allow the principal to avoid the risks of supervision carried out publicly on an across-the-board basis.

Second, we did not take into account either the principal's age or the mean teacher age. Both of these circumstances could operate as important influences on the relationship.

Notes and References for Chapter Six

1. As the table below indicates, elementary principals supervise more closely than junior high principals who in turn supervise more closely than senior high principals.

School Level and the Closeness
of Supervision

	<u>$\bar{X}$</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>N</u>
Elementary	8.29	2.00	175
Junior High	6.57	2.04	135
Senior High	5.60	2.10	144

$$F_{2,451} = 70.10; p < .01$$

$$t_{(E-J)} = 7.40; p < .01$$

$$t_{(E-S)} = 11.58; p < .01$$

$$t_{(J-S)} = 3.90; p < .01$$

2. See Chapter Three, pp. 3-10 -- 3-19.

3. It frequently happens that fairly young people are appointed as principals -- particularly at the elementary level -- over the heads of very experienced teachers. In situations of this kind, the principal is likely to find himself at a disadvantage. Although some principals are undoubtedly incompetent, the problem probably exists most frequently in the form of an inexperienced principal -- relatively "incompetent" at the present but not necessarily forever -- leading experienced teachers.

4. If we translate our contention into the familiar language of Barnard (The Functions of the Executive), loyalty represents one aspect

of the "zone of indifference." To say that the teachers are very loyal to the principal is to say that they have a wide zone of indifference.

5. See Appendix B-5 for a description of the statistical properties of the loyalty measure.

6. It should be noted that in obtaining the index of teacher loyalty the factor analysis was performed on the mean teacher score for each school rather than on the individual scores of teachers. In obtaining summary measures of teacher responses in all preceding and subsequent analyses where factor analyses are employed, the factor analysis is based on the individual scores of teachers.

7. At the junior high level, the teacher-specialization argument applies to some extent though not as clearly as in the high schools. As we argued earlier, however, the principal is confronted with a different set of strains based on the hypothesized instability of the junior high school atmosphere. If teachers are not committed to staying at the school but nevertheless have a sense of personal allegiance to the principal, the risks he faces in staff supervision can be mitigated.

8. See Appendix B-6 for a description of the statistical properties of the satisfaction with leadership measure.

9. School personnel (from the superintendent on down) are appointed, not elected; there are no prescribed procedures for guaranteeing periodic turnover in office; there is nothing in school organization corresponding to a two- or multi-party system with formalized arrangements both for gaining office and serving as a loyal opposition for extended periods of time.

10. In our interviews with principals, a number of them stated explicitly that they used staff participation as a strategic maneuver (and in some cases as a cynical one) in order to gain the support of staff members. Others apparently used the rhetoric of democracy without any awareness of the limitations of their ideas in the context of school organization.

11. See, for example, George C. Homans, Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1961), pp. 299-307, for the contrast between liking and respect; Robert F. Bales, "The Equilibrium Problem in Small Groups," in Talcott Parsons, Robert F. Bales, and Edward A. Shils, Working Papers in the Theory of Action (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1953), pp. 143-161, for the distinction between the "top initiator" and the "best liked" man; and see A. W. Halpin and B. J. Winer, The Leadership Behavior of the Airplane Commander (Columbus: Ohio State University Research Foundation, 1962) for the distinction between initiating structure and consideration.

12. The weights used in computing the correlation matrix on which the factor analysis was based were: "outstanding" (6), "excellent" (5), "good" (4), "fair" (3), "poor" (2), "very poor" (1).

13. See Appendix B-7 for a description of the statistical properties of the instructional leadership measure.

14. See Appendix B-8 for a description of the statistical properties of the human relations measure.

Chapter 7: Support of Innovation

Criticism of the public schools and pressure for change is nothing new in American education. In the last 15 years, both have been intense though not in all cases either constructive or feasible. Recently many school systems have introduced programs designed to provide tougher intellectual fare for able pupils and to tap the hidden talents of children from "disadvantaged" backgrounds. In addition, there has been growing interest among scholars in the academic disciplines to rewrite school curricula in their particular areas so that teachers have the resources and materials necessary to present their subjects with some intellectual rigor.

In this chapter we are concerned not with the introduction of any given educational innovation but with circumstances associated with a principal's conformity to his self-expectation to support innovation in his school. Despite the fact that there tends to be a favorable climate for educational innovation, the task of the principal in supporting change is by no means an easy one for reasons we shall spell out in some detail throughout this chapter. Aside from the fact that any innovation requires some departure from the status quo, and thus is a venture into the unknown, the principal, through his actions, affects the varying interests of teachers, parents, and pupils. His actions also have ramifications for general policy in the school system. There are inevitable risks in any situation in which one group is affected differently than others and where there are diverse interests represented within each group.

As we noted in Chapter Two, there are theoretical reasons to believe

that structural variations associated with school level are relevant to the principal's performance, in this case to his support of innovative practices. Therefore, as in the previous chapter, we shall test the hypotheses to be examined in this one for each school level. It is relevant, however, first to determine whether principals' support of innovation is associated with school level.¹

The results indicate that elementary principals support innovation more than junior and senior high principals but that junior and senior high principals do not differ in this respect.

Teacher Characteristics

An element of risk inheres in innovation almost by definition; if the magnitude of change is more than trivial, any departure from the current state of affairs brings uncertainty with it. In addition to risk generally conceived, there are specific kinds of risk peculiar to innovation in the school setting; and the principal must confront them. In his relationship with teachers, the principal who supports innovative practices faces a number of potential dangers.

First, when teachers have been doing a creditable job with methods they have developed over an extended period of years, expecting them to change and to adopt procedures that have yet to be tested over time can produce considerable strain and resentment among them.

Second, older teachers, whether or not they are capable and highly experienced, may find the introduction of innovations into the program very threatening. They may not have had the requisite training, and

nearing the close of their working careers, may not want to acquire it.

Third, if the younger and more inexperienced teachers are the carriers of new ideas and practices, the principal's support of innovation may in effect increase the prestige and power of a pro-innovation segment of the faculty at the expense of other teachers whose position in the school has been heretofore established on the basis of experience and tenure.

In short, the principal's backing of innovative practices, whatever their source, may create as unintended by-products shifts of status and power and resentment among staff members, as well as increasing demands upon teachers' time and disruptions of routine through the inevitable uncertainties that accompany departures from the past.² Even though a principal who supports innovation reflects the contemporary currents for educational change, his actions, because he must work through a socially diversified staff, may produce considerable strain in his organization and for himself.

Teacher Expectations

Before acting with respect to his self-conception of his role, we assume that the principal takes into account the risks involved. We have maintained that in supporting innovation a principal could be exposed to teacher resentment of, and resistance to, his efforts and that his actions could thus result in considerable stress for his organization and himself. It seems reasonable to assume that one condition that a principal would take into account in assessing the risks to himself and for his school would be the expectations of his teachers for his performance.

If they endorse his desire to stimulate educational change, then he could be expected to perceive less risk in performing in accord with his predilection. However, if they hold the opposite point of view, the principal could anticipate greater risk in conforming to his self-expectation. If, as we assume, the less risk involved in a desired course of action, the greater the willingness of a principal to engage in it, then the hypothesis follows that: the stronger the sentiments among a principal's teachers that he support innovation, the more the principal will act according to his own disposition to behave in this manner.

To measure the expectations of teachers in each of the schools with respect to their principal's support of innovation, we used the mean of the Teachers' Expectation Scores.³ When we correlated their scores with their principal's role performance score, the findings reveal support for the hypothesis at each school level (Table 7-1).

Teacher Competence

Among principals who are predisposed to support innovation in their schools, it is reasonable to assume that they will vary in their assessment of the competency of their staffs. We now shall argue that this circumstance will influence their conforming to their self-expectation to serve as a stimulator of educational change.

A principal who has a relatively high evaluation of the ability of his teachers could anticipate that his efforts to introduce new educational ideas or programs into his school would lead to a minimum of disruption in the functioning of the school and of upset in teacher-teacher

Table 7-1. The Relationship between Teacher Expectations for Support of Innovation and Principals' Conformity to Self-Expectations in This Area, by School Level
(Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	<u>r</u>	N
Elementary	.39*	165
Junior High	.39*	119
Senior High	.34*	137

* $p < .05$; one-tailed test

and in teacher-pupil relationships. This is the case, we assume, because he would believe that his able staff could readily adjust to change and could effectively cope with the inconveniences and difficulties associated with it. A principal who holds a relatively low assessment of his staff's competence, however, would be considerably more hesitant to behave in accord with his self-expectation because he could anticipate serious stresses and strains in his school as a consequence of his support of innovation. In short, from the principal's perspective, a faculty of high competence represents a risk-reducing circumstance and one of low ability, a condition of increased risk. On the basis of this reasoning, we hypothesize that: a principal's assessment of the competency of his staff will be positively related to his conformity to his self-expectation to support innovation in his school.

As a measure of the principal's assessment of his staff's competence, we asked each of them, "What percentage of the teachers in your school competently carry out their teaching assignments?" Their responses to this question were reported in Chapter Six (Table 6-3).

The findings, although in the predicted direction at each school level, are not significant statistically at below the .05 level (Table 7-2); therefore we interpret them as offering no support for the hypothesis. Several points can be made in the way of their interpretation. First, the competence of his teachers may not, as we assumed, be considered a risk-reducing resource by the principal. Second, it is possible that the more troublesome risks arise not in the principal's relationship with his teachers but in his dealings with parents or higher administrators;

Table 7-2. The Relationship between Teacher Competence (Principals' Estimates of the Percentage of Teachers on the Staff Who Competently Carry Out Their Teaching Assignments) and Principals' Conformity to Self-Expectations to Support Innovation, by School Level (Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	<u>r</u>	N
Elementary	-.09	165
Junior High	-.12	117
Senior High	-.09	134

and if this contention is true, the fact that teachers are able to cope with the strains of innovation may be of less importance in light of the origins of the principal's difficulties.

Teacher Loyalty to the Principal

Since the principal's support of innovation may affect the work of teachers by necessitating sacrifices in their time and energy, disrupting their routines, and possibly threatening long-standing status relationships, if he can count on their personal loyalty to him, he is in a far stronger position when asking for their cooperation in a demanding enterprise. As we have argued in the preceding chapter, he is in a less risky position to mobilize their efforts if he has their personal allegiance, if he has a bank of good will. We hypothesize, therefore, that the greater the teachers' personal loyalty to the principal, the more likely he will support innovation according to his own personal convictions. Our measurement of teacher loyalty was described in detail in Chapter Six.

When we correlated our index of teacher loyalty with the principal's support of innovation score, the findings reveal support for the hypothesis at each school level (Table 7-3).

Higher Administrator Characteristics

In the case of closeness of supervision, the impact of the principal's behavior was primarily a matter of internal concern to the school; although the characteristics of high administrators were relevant as risk-reducing resources, the higher administration was not directly

Table 7-3. The Relationship between Teacher Loyalty to Principals and Their Conformity to Self-Expectations to Support Innovation, by School Level (Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	<u>r</u>	N
Elementary	.30*	159
Junior High	.23*	105
Senior High	.44*	130

* $p < .05$; one-tailed test.

affected by the principal's actions. Here the situation is different: if the principal actively supports innovation within his school, this course of action could have important implications for problems of concern to the higher administration.

Despite the fact that individual schools are widely dispersed geographically throughout a city and differ according to the peculiarities of their districts, they are linked together by means of a centralized administrative apparatus. They must operate within the context of general system policies and meet standards that apply across the board. An innovation of some magnitude taking place in one school may well constitute a challenge to long established rules and regulations and may lead to invidious comparisons of one school against another by teachers and members of various school districts. An innovation, almost by definition, means "being out of line," for good or for ill.⁴ By supporting innovation, therefore, the principal creates risks for himself because his school has direct linkages both with the higher administration and with other schools of the same general type (e.g., level, size, and socioeconomic composition).

Higher Administrator Expectations

If members of the higher administration expect principals under their jurisdiction to support innovation, this in itself can potentially render the principal's situation more secure. Such an expectation represents an acknowledgement that the higher administration is generally favorable to innovation and that introducing changes into schools is generally endorsed. The principal's risks are mitigated by the knowledge

that he can count on the moral and material support for his efforts of his superiors. To the extent higher administrators are positively disposed toward the principal's actions, his risks vis-à-vis them, we assume, are thereby reduced.

The origin of all risks, however, is not found in the central office; as we noted in earlier sections of this chapter, it arises as well from teachers and members of the community. If the principal's administrative superiors expect him to support innovation, their backing represents a valuable resource for him in dealing with teachers and parents. He can claim central office backing for his activities to his teachers, and he can refer critical parents to the central office. We hypothesize, therefore, that the more his immediate administrative superior favors his support of innovation, the more the principal conforms to his self-expectation to act in this manner.

To obtain a measure of the expectations held by higher administrators for principals under their jurisdiction in this area, we used the same procedures described in Chapter Six (p. 6-19) to secure an index of their expectations for closeness of supervision. Although the findings are in the direction anticipated at each school level, only the correlation coefficient for high schools is significant statistically at below the .05 level and thus we can claim support for our hypothesis only at that school level (Table 7-4).

What could account for the contextual nature of our findings? A plausible interpretation is the following: the risks of staff resistance to the principal's innovative efforts are greater at the high school

Table 7-4. The Relationship between Higher Administrator Expectations for Support of Innovation and Principals' Conformity to Self-Expectations in This Area, by School Level (Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	<u>r</u>	N
Elementary	.09	160
Junior High	.10	118
Senior High	.18*	127

* $p < .05$; one-tailed test.

level than at the other two because of the more specialized nature of the high school teachers' work. Hence, the backing of the higher administration represents a much greater risk-reducing resource for him than for his elementary and junior high counterparts.

Principal Participation in Staff Recruitment

School systems vary in how much principals have to say about selecting who will work for them and in the extent to which they participate in the recruitment process. In attempting to introduce innovative practices into the school, the principal must depend to a considerable extent on the willingness of his teachers to go along with him even when doing so places added demands upon their time and energy. If he cannot count on his faculty, an innovative venture is a risky one indeed.

We contend that a principal will be exposed to less risk in supporting innovation when he does participate in the process of recruiting teachers. Since he depends on them for the success of the venture,⁵ having a hand in recruitment permits him to identify teachers who are most likely to be personally compatible with him and with other members of his staff. Moreover, because his teachers are aware that their principal was centrally involved in their selection, they recognize that he preferred them to others and recognizes their talents. Thus, we hypothesize that the more frequently the principal is able to participate in the teacher recruitment process, the more likely he acts according to his own disposition to support innovation.

Using the measure of principal involvement in the recruitment process described in Chapter Six, p. 6-23, we found support for the hypothesis

only at the elementary school level (Table 7-5).

If our reasoning was correct, the findings suggest that elementary principals, by participating in the recruitment process, are better able to reduce their risks than secondary principals. We suggest a possible reason why this may be the case. The sense of personal compatibility with respect to their support of innovation is likely to be more salient for elementary than for secondary principals because elementary schools are smaller, on the average, and thus provide more opportunities for principals and teachers to have close social contacts. At the secondary levels, where these contacts are less frequent, personal compatibility is not as important and the absence of it, therefore, not as likely to be a source of risk.

Characteristics of Principals

To this point we have considered the characteristics of their superiors and subordinates that might affect the principals' conformity to self-expectations. Now we turn to the principals' characteristics that our theoretical formulation led us to anticipate would be relevant to role behavior of this kind.

Age

The principals in each school level varied greatly in age (Table 7-6), and we reasoned as follows about the way this personal attribute might be related to conformity to self-expectations: opportunities for career advancement decline for older principals, and to the degree that

Table 7-5. The Relationship between the Extent Principals Are Allowed by the Higher Administration to Evaluate Teaching Applicants Being Considered for Appointment to Their Schools and Principals' Conformity to Self-Expectations to Support Innovation, by School Level (Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	<u>r</u>	N
Elementary	.20*	157
Junior High	.04	114
Senior High	.04	133

* $p < .05$; one-tailed test.

Table 7-6. The Age Distribution of Principals, by School Level

Age	Elementary		Junior High		Senior High	
	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent
40 and under	48	25.4	16	10.7	19	11.8
41 - 45	23	12.2	35	23.3	28	17.4
46 - 50	46	24.3	34	22.7	35	21.7
51 - 55	39	20.6	36	24.0	42	26.1
56 - 60	24	12.7	25	16.7	27	16.8
61 and over	9	4.8	4	2.7	10	6.2
Total	189	100.0	150	100.1	161	100.0

supporting innovation is one means of demonstrating competence and making a mark, there is less reason for principals to do this toward the end of their career. They have little to gain in terms of prestige, advancement, or responsibility, and much to lose if plans go awry. Younger principals, while they may have much to lose, also have much to gain in terms of educational accomplishment within their schools, personal advancement, or both. On these grounds, therefore, we hypothesized that there is an inverse relationship between the age of principals and their support of innovation in conformity to their self-expectations.

When the age of principals was correlated with their support of innovation scores, we found support for our hypothesis at the elementary and senior high levels but not at the junior high level (Table 7-7).

Authoritarian Values

We consider authoritarian values as an attribute of personality, an attribute that is somewhat "deeper" -- less easy to verbalize, less specific to particular situations -- than self-expectations. Since it represents a personality characteristic that apparently pervades a variety of social situations, it is not easy to attach some particular behavioral manifestation to it;⁶ in effect, then, some inference about the impact of personality on behavior must be made.

It is our contention that authoritarian principals are more likely to see issues in terms of black and white, to expect others to act in terms of command and obedience, and hence will have experienced more difficulties in staff relations than non-authoritarian principals.

If, as we have assumed, principals are aware that to be successful

Table 7-7. The Relationship between Principals' Age and Their Conformity to Self-Expectations to Support Innovation by School Level (Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	<u>r</u>	<u>N</u>
Elementary	-.22*	167
Junior High	-.05	119
Senior High	-.20*	136

* $p < .05$; one-tailed test.

in supporting innovation, they must depend on the willingness of teachers to cooperate and to make sacrifices of time and energy that would be unnecessary in the ordinary course of events; and if more authoritarian principals have in the past had greater difficulty in enlisting such support from teachers than less authoritarian ones, the former will perceive their exposure to greater risk if they support innovation. We, therefore, hypothesize that the more authoritarian the principals, the less they act according to their self-expectations to support innovation.

We obtained a measure of authoritarian values by asking our respondents to complete the Value Profile,⁷ a questionnaire containing statements representing a wide spectrum of values on which respondents state the extent to which they agree or disagree with each of them. The responses were factor analyzed (Varimax solution) for the sample of principals. One set of items whose content closely resembled those on the original F-scale -- in fact, some of the items on the Profile were taken directly from the F-scale -- clustered on a single factor which we used as our measure of authoritarianism.⁸ We list these items below:⁹

1. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.
2. What youth needs most is strict discipline, rugged determination, and the will to work and fight for family and country.
3. Patriotism and loyalty are the first and the most important requirements of a good citizen.
4. You have to respect authority, and when you stop

respecting authority, your situation isn't worth much

5. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel a great love, gratitude, and respect for his parents.
6. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down.
7. The most important qualities of a real man are determination and driving ambition.
8. No sane, normal, decent person could ever think of hurting a close friend or relative.
9. Our modern industrial and scientific developments are signs of a greater degree of success than that attained by any previous society.
10. When we live in the proper way -- stay in harmony with the forces of nature, and keep all that we have in good condition, then all will go well in the world.

When we correlated principals' authoritarianism scores with their support of innovation scores, we found that although all relationships were in the predicted direction only those at the elementary and junior high school levels were statistically significant at below the .05 level (Table 7-8).

One possible explanation of why we do not find the relationship at the senior high school level is that principals in these schools do not

Table 7-8. The Relationship between Principals' Authoritarianism Scores and Their Conformity to Self-Expectations to Support Innovation by School Level (Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	<u>r</u>	<u>N</u>
Elementary	-.17*	167
Junior High	-.22*	119
Senior High	-.11	137

* $p < .05$; one-tailed test.

have as frequent or direct contact with their teachers as their elementary and junior high school counterparts. To the extent that innovative practices are supported in the high schools, it is likely that the task of teacher motivation falls more upon the shoulders of middle level administrators within the school rather than upon those of the principal.

Years Spent as a Teacher

Although teaching and administration are both specialties within education, the fact that they are part of the same general enterprise does not necessarily mean that they resemble each other as occupations. When we consider the stages of educational careers, however, teaching almost invariably precedes administration. The existence of this sequence of occupational stages presupposes an assumption that for a man to be a good administrator he must have been a teacher first.¹⁰ The assumption is questionable on the grounds that the qualities that make a good teacher are not necessarily those that make a good administrator. Our concern is not whether an administrator should have had some experience in a classroom -- probably he should if only to have a taste of it -- but whether the length of time spent in the classroom bears on his conformity to his self-expectation to support innovation. We present the distribution of the principals' experiences as teachers in Table 7-9.

From the perspective of an outsider looking at the principalship, a case can be made for the contention that for certain aspects of the principal's work, prolonged employment as a teacher may represent a trained incapacity. In the course of their work activities, teachers and

Table 7-9. The Distribution of Years Spent by Principals As Classroom Teachers, by School Level

Number of Years	Elementary		Junior High		Senior High	
	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent
00 - 04	25	13.4	21	14.1	37	23.4
05 - 09	52	27.8	50	33.6	57	36.1
10 - 14	46	24.6	38	25.5	42	26.6
15 - 19	30	16.0	25	16.8	15	9.5
20 - 24	16	8.6	12	8.1	5	3.2
25 - 29	15	8.0	3	2.0	2	1.3
30 - 34	3	1.6	-	-	-	-
Total	187	100.0	149	100.1	158	100.1

principals spend the better part of each day with markedly different publics; the scope of their responsibilities differs: one being responsible for the activities in a classroom, the other for the school as an organizational entity. Their problems in the exercise of authority also differ: one is concerned with managing an aggregate(s) of conscripted clients, the other with employees with a claim to professional status; and the catalogue of differences can be extended greatly despite the fact that teachers and principals work in the same setting and must confront certain common problems.

We maintain that the longer the time a principal has spent as a teacher, the more likely his perspectives will be limited to the kinds of problems that arise in classroom settings, and the less able he will be to understand problems from a school-wide vantage point or in terms of the school's place in the larger system (the latter two being important aspects of the principal's job). The support of innovation is a school-wide activity with some system-wide ramifications; the principal who engages in it with primarily a classroom perspective invites trouble in that mobilizing a faculty requires sophistication in the use of political skills -- we do not use this term in its pejorative sense -- more than it does instructional skills. Thus, to engage in this activity with resources more appropriate for coping with other kinds of problems is to increase the risks a principal must confront.¹¹

We hypothesize, therefore, that the greater the number of years a principal has spent as a classroom teacher, the less he conforms to his self-expectation to support innovation. Our findings are all in the

4

predicted direction but statistically significant only at the elementary and junior high levels (Table 7-10).

Principals' Skills: Instruction and Human Relations

Since the support of innovation is an activity in which the principal not only makes claim on teachers' time and energy but also one that makes him dependent on his faculty members, it is especially crucial that he have their respect. We argued earlier in Chapter Six that the risks involved in the principal supervising his staff would be mitigated if his teachers acknowledged his skills in the area of instruction and in his dealings with other people. The same arguments, we believe, apply to the support of innovation. Hence, we hypothesize that the more highly teachers rate the principal's abilities first, in matters of instruction, and second, in human relations, the more he will conform to his self-expectation to support innovation.

When we correlated our measures of the teachers' evaluation of their principal's performance in instructional leadership and his human relations skills (see Chapter Six, pp. 6-33 -- 6-34, for our measurement procedures). We found support for both hypotheses at each school level (Table 7-11).

Sharing of Responsibility with Teachers

We maintained at the beginning of this chapter that the principal's support of innovation is likely to have pervasive ramifications throughout the school affecting many aspects of the teachers' classroom work, the social relationships among teachers, and those between teachers and the school administration. Although the introduction of innovations is

Table 7-10. The Relationship between Number of Years Principals Have Spent as Classroom Teachers and Their Conformity to Self-Expectations to Support Innovation, by School Level (Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	<u>r</u>	N
Elementary	-.16*	165
Junior High	-.16*	118
Senior High	-.09	134

* $p < .05$; one-tailed test.

Table 7-11. The Relationship between Teacher Evaluation of Principals' Skills in the Areas of (A) Instructional Leadership; (B) Human Relations and Their Conformity to Self-Expectations to Support Innovation, by School Level (Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	<u>r</u>	N
A. <u>Instructional Leadership</u>		
Elementary	.68*	166
Junior High	.58*	119
Senior High	.66*	137
B. <u>Human Relations</u>		
Elementary	.29*	167
Junior High	.26*	119
Senior High	.37*	137

* $p < .05$; one-tailed test.

usually justified on the basis of anticipated gains, gains that may very well materialize in the form of improved instruction and/or an improved teaching situation, the concomitant costs -- inequities, increases in work load, ambiguities about what should be done, and so on -- constitute elements of risk with which the principal must cope.

To the extent that responsibility for school operation is shared with teachers, the principal provides himself with a social arrangement in which the difficult and controversial aspects of innovation can be discussed. In addition, this strategy of involving those who will be directly affected by a course of action, the teachers, provides opportunities for them to contribute their own thinking about innovations and for increasing teachers' obligations to participate fully in the innovative program. If they have had something to say in shaping the program, it is not unreasonable to expect them to have an obligation to carry it out. From the viewpoint of the principal, the risks in his own situation then can be reduced by means of a cooptative strategy. We hypothesize, therefore, that the more a principal shares responsibility with his teachers in decision making, the more likely he will conform to his own expectation of supporting innovation.

When we used our measures of "shared responsibility" described in Chapter Six, pp. 6-29 -- 6-30, to test the hypothesis, we found support for our hypothesis in each area of shared responsibility and at all three school levels (Table 7-12).

Table 7-12. The Relationship between the Involvement of Teachers in Four Decision Areas and Principals' Conformity to Self-Expectations to Support Innovation, by School Level (Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	<u>r</u>	<u>N</u>
<u>Pupil Performance</u>		
Elementary	.42*	167
Junior High	.46*	119
Senior High	.41*	137
<u>School Evaluation</u>		
Elementary	.50*	167
Junior High	.47*	119
Senior High	.41*	137
<u>Teacher Evaluation</u>		
Elementary	.42*	167
Junior High	.38*	119
Senior High	.34*	137
<u>Discipline Policy</u>		
Elementary	.40*	167
Junior High	.42*	119
Senior High	.48*	137

* $p < .05$; one-tailed test.

Dealing with the Community

Innovations are bound to be matters of concern both to parents and to organized interests in the school community (especially those who call upon the schools to incorporate their particular pet projects). Changes in curriculum often arouse apprehension among parents that their children will not be taught "the fundamentals" or that they will be put at a disadvantage in regard to college admission, whether or not such anxieties are justified. In any case, there is ample ideological justification for parents to make themselves heard on educational matters, and principals can be anticipated to pay attention to voices from the community when questions of school innovation arise.

The risks inherent in the principal's support of innovation derive from at least two sources: the first is the community itself; the second is the teachers. Since parents are frequently concerned about what innovations take place within the schools, one strategy for coping with this concern is to encourage parental participation. Despite the risks associated with parental involvement, the principal can use the opportunities provided by this parental contact to interpret the anticipated changes to parents, anticipate and answer criticism, and attempt to stimulate community support for the school's program. To the extent that the principal uses the opportunity provided through parental participation in the above ways, the risks of supporting innovation can be reduced; thus, we hypothesize that the more a principal involves parents in his school's affairs, the more he supports innovation, given his own propensity to do so.

Second, in regard to teachers: we have already described the risks

faced by principals vis-à-vis teachers associated with innovation. However, if the principal is skillful in the way he deals with the community, and the teachers acknowledge his skill, risk in this area is thereby diminished. Thus, we also hypothesize that the greater the principal's skill in dealing with the community, the more he conforms to his self-expectation to support innovation within the school.

We have described in Chapter Three the procedures we used to measure the principal's involvement of parents in school affairs. Our index of the principal's skills in dealing with the community was based on the responses of the teachers to the following questions: "To what extent does your principal engage in the following kinds of behavior (always, almost always, occasionally, almost never, never):"

1. Gains the respect of parents when he speaks out on educational matters.
2. Keeps parents informed about school activities.
3. Makes himself available to parents who want to discuss school problems.
4. Handles inquiries from parents in an effective manner.
5. Gets support of parents when introducing new programs.
6. Obtains cooperation of parents of students with academic difficulties.¹²

A 6-item Guttman scale with a coefficient of reproducibility of .954 was developed from their responses to these items to represent each teacher's description of his principal's skill in dealing with the community. The scale scores of the teachers in each school were averaged

to obtain the best estimate of their principal's skill.

When we used these two measures to test our hypotheses that a principal's involvement of parents in school affairs and his skill in dealing with the community would be positively related to the principal's conformity to his self-expectation to support innovation, we found support for both of them (Table 7-13).

Principal Self-expectations

We contend, as we did in Chapter Six, that individuals do not necessarily refrain from acting until all traces of risk and uncertainty have been eliminated; on the contrary, some people act in spite of the risks entailed if they believe it is important enough to do so; that is, if there are overriding considerations.

One consideration of this kind is the strength of the principals' self-expectations. Even among those positively disposed to support innovation, they vary in the strength of their conviction; for the more strongly disposed, we assume that the anticipated risks become less of a consideration in the decision to act. Thus, we hypothesize that the stronger a principal's self-expectation to support innovation the more likely he will conform to it.

To measure the intensity of the principals' self-expectation to support innovation, we used their self-expectation scores, the measurement of which was described in Chapter Three. The findings reveal that the hypothesis is supported at each school level (Table 7-14).

Table 7-13. The Relationship between (A) Principals' Involvement of Parents in School Affairs; (B) Principals' Skill in Dealing with the Community and Their Conformity to Self-Expectations to Support Innovation, by School Level (Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	<u>r</u>	<u>N</u>
A. <u>Principals' Involvement of Parents in School Affairs</u>		
Elementary	.51*	167
Junior High	.56*	119
Senior High	.56*	137
B. <u>Principals' Skill in Dealing with the Community</u>		
Elementary	.33*	166
Junior High	.40*	119
Senior High	.47*	137

* $p < .05$; one-tailed test.

Table 7-14. The Relationship between Principal Self-Expectations to Support Innovation and Conformity to Them, by School Level (Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	<u>r</u>	<u>N</u>
Elementary	.27*	161
Junior High	.20*	117
Senior High	.20*	137

* $p < .05$; one-tailed test.

Conflict between Pupil and Teacher Interests

In schools the major justification for engaging in innovative efforts is that they will contribute to the welfare of the pupils. Whether or not the expected benefits actually accrue is not the issue here; the justification itself is of primary importance, if the principal gives greater primacy to the welfare of his pupils than his teachers when their interests are opposed. That is, if a principal feels that his primary obligation is to his clients rather than his staff, then it seems reasonable to assume that he will be more willing to incur the potential risk of teacher resentment because of the increased work load and strains that often accompany innovative activity. We thus hypothesize that the greater the priority a principal gives to the interests of pupils over those of his teachers, the more he will conform to his self-expectation to support innovation.

To test the hypothesis we developed a measure of the priority principals give to pupil over teacher interests in each school to three questions in the Principal's Role Questionnaire. These questions were selected by means of a factor analysis of 16 items dealing with a principal's orientation to the relations between teacher and pupil from which two factors had emerged. The three questions were: "How frequently (always, almost always, occasionally, almost never, never) does your principal engage in the following kinds of activities?"

1. Encourage teachers to give extra help in their "free" periods to students needing that help.
2. Put the student's welfare above that of the teachers when the two are opposed.

3. Encourage worthwhile student activities that would require additional work by teachers.¹³

To secure the best estimate of the priority principals give to pupil over teacher interests, we first computed a score for each teacher respondent based on weights derived from loadings on the factor and then averaged the teachers' scores in each school to obtain a summary measure of their principal's behavior.

When the principals' scores on this index were correlated with their support of innovation scores, the hypothesis received support at each school level (Table 7-15).

Socio-economic Status of Schools

Of the three types of role behavior considered in this study, the support of innovation has perhaps the most pervasive implications for the community at large. Depending on the nature and magnitude of the changes contemplated, the quality of instruction and the life chances of many school children are at stake. In the context of this investigation, it is difficult to draw the boundary between school and community (school district) because the latter penetrates the former.

The socio-economic composition of a student body represents a micro-cosm of the school community; by implication, the characteristics of pupils provide some indication of the educational interests of families in the school district, of what is expected of the school. Innovation in the school program, therefore, is likely to affect members of the community differently depending on their location in it according to

Table 7-15. The Relationship between Principal Priority Assigned to Pupil over Teacher Interests and Conformity to Self-Expectations to Support Innovation, by School Level (Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	<u>r</u>	<u>N</u>
Elementary	.36*	167
Junior High	.25*	119
Senior High	.26*	137

* $p < .05$; one-tailed test.

socio-economic criteria. Two distinct arguments can be made for the relationship between the socio-economic composition of schools and the principal's conformity to his self-expectation to support innovation.

First, in relatively high socio-economic level communities, one would expect to find parental pressures favoring curricular innovations that serve the academic interests of pupils, especially those who anticipate entering college. A principal who resisted such pressures, either by ignoring them or by investing the resources of the school in other areas, would subject himself to risks: primarily the danger of losing community support for the school program. According to this line of argument, the higher the socio-economic level of the community, the more likely the principal will support innovation (or at least the kind of innovation suggested above).

A different line of argument is also defensible. In recent years there has been increasing concern with the problem of providing adequate schooling for socially disadvantaged children, with providing a climate within the school that compensates for the cultural impoverishment of homes in the lower socio-economic areas (impoverishment, that is, in terms of the academic achievement standards that schools represent), and with providing at the minimum a program that will make post-school employment more likely. Thus, in the lower socio-economic areas, we would also expect to find considerable pressure for educational innovation (though not necessarily originating from the parents in the community). Again, the principal who resisted such pressures would also subject himself to a considerable extent.

These opposite lines of reasoning lead us to a null hypothesis: there will be no relationship between the socio-economic composition of schools and principals' conformity to their self-expectations to support innovation.

We measured the average socio-economic status of pupils in each school by asking principals to estimate the proportion of families in the school district possessing six socio-economic characteristics. We used this procedure by adopting the widely accepted proposition that all members of any nuclear family have the same location in the socio-economic hierarchy of a society. By asking principals to describe the social origins of the student body, we measured a characteristic of each school by assigning to it a characteristic of the district that it serves.

More specifically, each principal provided us with estimates of the proportion of families in the district having different levels of educational achievement, holding different jobs, and earning different incomes. These estimates were then factor-analyzed, and from this analysis we were able to assign each school a socio-economic status score. The six questions we asked the principals were as follows: "What percentage of the students in your school:"

2. Come from homes where at least one parent is a college graduate?
6. Come from homes where neither parent has gone to school beyond high school?
1. Come from homes where the father is a professional

person, business executive, or manager?

5. Come from homes where the father is an unskilled or semi-skilled worker?

And, "What percentage of the parents of these students:"

3. Have a combined family income of \$10,000 or more?
4. Have a combined family income of less than \$5,000?¹⁴

The findings reveal support for the null hypothesis at each school level (Table 7-16).

Table 7-16. The Relationship between the Socio-Economic Status Score of Schools and Their Principals' Conformity to Self-Expectations to Support Innovation, by School Level (Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	<u>r</u>	N
Elementary	.01	165
Junior High	.12	119
Senior High	-.09	137

Notes and References for Chapter Seven

1. As the table below indicates, elementary principals support innovation more than secondary principals; there is no significant difference between junior and senior high school principals.

School Level and Support
of Innovation

	<u>$\bar{X}$</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>N</u>
Elementary	6.21	2.17	175
Junior High	5.08	1.98	135
Senior High	5.15	2.14	144

$$F_{2,451} = 14.36; p < .01$$

$$t_{(E-J)} = 4.78; p < .01$$

$$t_{(E-S)} = 4.36; p < .01$$

$$t_{(J-S)} = 0.28; n.s.$$

2. We do not imply here that routine and tradition are categorically undesirable; innovation is especially problematic when the customary ways of doing things have proved workable and gratifying to teachers.

3. See Chapter Three, pp. 3-10 -- 3-19.

4. Principals appear acutely aware of this fact; in our interviews, they almost invariably describe the first step in any innovative venture as clearing with the higher administration.

5. Note that in regard to supervision and parental involvement the principal does not need his teachers to carry out these activities. He may put them under strain by engaging in these activities and increase

the risks to himself by doing so, but the teachers are not the instruments necessary for close supervision and parental involvement as they are in the case of the principal's support of innovation.

6. In the case of authoritarianism, there is no simple parallel between personality characteristic and behavior comparable to that between, for example, role expectation and role behavior. In his critique of The Authoritarian Personality, Edward A. Shils, "Authoritarianism: 'Right' and 'Left,'" in Richard Christie and Marie Jahoda (Editors), Studies in the Scope and Method of "The Authoritarian Personality" (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1954), p. 43, noted that there is no evidence in the study that those subjects who score high on the F-scale actually participate in Fascist social movements.

7. For a description of this questionnaire, see Robert F. Bales and Arthur S. Couch, "The Value Profile: A Factor Analytic Study of Value Sentiments" (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1959), unpublished manuscript.

8. See Appendix B-9 for a description of the statistical properties of the authoritarianism measure.

9. The authoritarianism factor was one of seven that emerged from the factor analysis; we labeled the others as follows: (1) religious ideology, (2) need-determined expression versus value-determined restraint, (3) individualism, (4) inner-direction, (5) equalitarianism, and (6) zest for life. In addition to the authoritarian factor, numbers 2, 3, 4, and 5 corresponded very closely to those found by Bales who used the Profile with several different groups of subjects none of

whom were school principals.

10. This type of assumption is not universal in occupations; in medicine, for example, hospital administration has developed as an occupation open to non-physicians as well as to physicians. There is at least a tacit acknowledgement in this arrangement that medical practice is not necessarily appropriate preparation for hospital administration.

11. The irony of the situation is that the intimate knowledge of classroom skills and problems that able and reflective teachers may develop during a long tenure in the classroom may actually get in the way of the ex-teacher who accedes to the principalship. This is not to deny that some teachers, both excellent and poor ones, do in fact possess the relevant political skills for coping with the school-wide problems of innovation.

12. See Appendix B-10 for a description of the statistical properties of the skill in dealing with the community measure.

13. See Appendix B-11 for a description of the statistical properties of the teacher versus pupil interest measure.

14. See Appendix B-4 for a description of the socio-economic status of schools measure.

Chapter 8: Involvement of Parents in School Affairs

In this chapter we examine conditions in the work environment of school principals that may account in part for their conformity to their self-expectation to involve parents in various aspects of school life. Parental participation in schools represents one manifestation of a much broader question that is problematic for many if not all types of large-scale organizations: to what extent should the clients of an organization have a legitimate right to be involved in its operation? In schools the issue is sharply drawn since they fall within that general class of organizations in which professionalized workers perform a service for lay clients; but, in addition, the lay clients of schools -- parents, in this case¹ -- can claim an ideological justification for their involvement and have easy physical access to them as well.

As in the two preceding chapters, we shall present our analysis for each school level. It is of interest to note initially, however, that principals in the elementary schools involve parents in school affairs more frequently than those at the secondary levels.²

Teacher Characteristics

The principal who invites the participation of parents in matters of school operation does not affect his teachers directly as he does when he supervises their classroom performance. The fact that teachers may feel the impact of his actions indirectly does not mean, however, that the impact is of little consequence; on the contrary, it may be very great. By inviting the participation of parents, the principal may create situations in which professionals and laymen confront each other

directly, or in which lay contributions are solicited in areas that professionals may consider as falling within their own province.

Teacher Expectations

One claim that members of an occupation can make to professional status is that its practitioners possess esoteric skills and knowledge not available to the clients who seek their services. By implication, a professionalized worker is one who does not accept the client's definition of what constitutes good practice. The principal who involves parents centrally in the operation of the school and the content of its program in effect acknowledges that the contributions of parents should be taken seriously even though they have no claim to expertness in education.

It is highly unlikely that principals encourage parental participation in order to subject the judgment of teachers to review by laymen; the reasons for doing so are probably in part ideological (in a democratic society, the people affected by decisions should have a voice in making them), and in part political (the purpose of the schools is to serve the needs of the local community, and parents should be called in to express themselves about those needs and to lend support to the school's program). However lofty the motives, the effect of the principal's actions is often to place teachers and parents in a relationship of near parity.

To the extent that the principal communicates by his actions that the judgments of untrained laymen on educational matters should be considered as seriously as those of trained professionals, he runs the risk of arousing resentment among his teachers through the downgrading of

of their status.³ If teachers, for reasons of their own -- ideological or pragmatic -- expect the principal to encourage parental involvement, they indicate in effect that the participation of parents is not in principle a source of resentment. Therefore, given the principal's self-expectations for parental participation, we hypothesize that the more strongly teachers expect the principal to involve parents in school affairs, the more he will conform to his own expectation to do so.

We measured teachers' expectations for the principal's involvement of parents by averaging the teachers' expectation scores in each school.⁴ When we related these scores to their principal's role performance score, the data indicate support for the hypothesis at each school level (Table 8-1).

Teacher Academic Preparation

We have shown earlier that schools at each level vary in the proportion of their teachers holding advanced degrees (Table 6-2). We contend that principals whose staffs differ on the average in their academic preparation will be exposed to varying risks in involving parents in school affairs.

The more highly trained a principal's staff, the greater the likelihood that he will create resentment among its members by confronting them with the judgment of laymen on professional matters and thereby increase the risks to which he will be exposed. On the basis of this reasoning, we hypothesize that the larger the proportion of highly trained teachers on his staff, the less he conforms to his own expectation to involve parents.

Table 8-1. The Relationship between Teacher Expectation for Involvement of Parents in School Affairs and Principals' Conformity to Self-Expectations in This Area, by School Level (Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	<u>r</u>	N
Elementary	.45*	105
Junior High	.37*	57
Senior High	.32*	78

* $p < .05$; one-tailed test.

As an index of the academic preparation of his staff, we used the proportion of teachers holding a Master's or higher degree. Our findings clearly offer no support for our prediction (Table 8-2). At the elementary and junior high school levels, the direction of the findings are in contradiction to our prediction although they are not significant statistically at below the .05 level using a two-tailed test. At the senior high level, the low correlation coefficient is negative, but is also not significant. We conclude, therefore, that our hypothesis receives no support.

At the secondary levels where advanced academic training implies subject matter specialization, the training that comes with the degree program may provide no specialized skills in coping with clients. The lack of relationship, therefore, may indicate the irrelevance of the training for this particular aspect of the teacher's job. The principal, then, may or may not face risks depending on whether members of his staff have the desire and/or the competence to deal with parents; and there may be considerable variation, both positive and negative, in the distribution of these desires and skills such that they cancel each other out at the zero-order of correlations. The same line of reasoning may account for the absence of relationship when the principal's estimate of teacher competence is considered.

Teacher Loyalty to the Principal

The risks related to the principal's involvement of parents arise from the potential conflict between professional and lay interests. As in the two preceding chapters, we interpret teacher loyalty as representing

Table 8-2. The Relationship between Teacher Competence
(Percentage of Teachers in Each School Holding the Master's
Degree) and Principals' Conformity to Self-Expectations to
Involve Parents in School Affairs, by School Level
(Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	r	N
Elementary	.18	105
Junior High	.20	56
Senior High	-.06	79

a bank of good will for the principal; we assume that the risks inherent in his actions are reduced when he can count on his teachers going along with him because he has their personal allegiance. Thus, we hypothesize that the greater the degree of teacher loyalty, the more the principal acts in accord with his own disposition to involve parents in school affairs.

Using the measure of teacher loyalty described earlier in Chapter Six, pp. 6-12 -- 6-13, we find support for our hypothesis only at the elementary and senior high school levels (Table 8-3). The direction of the relationship is as predicted for the junior high level but is not significant statistically at below the .05 level.

Teacher Satisfaction with the Principal's Leadership

Whether or not teachers have a strong sense of personal loyalty to the principal, if they are satisfied with him as their administrative leader, his risks are reduced because he can count on them even when his own actions might affect their interests adversely. Therefore, we hypothesize that the more satisfied teachers are with the principal's leadership, the more likely he will encourage parental participation (according to his own convictions on the question).

When we correlated our index of teacher satisfaction with the principals' leadership (see Chapter Six, p. 6-16, for our measure of this variable) and the principals' scores on involvement of parents in school affairs, the data revealed support for the hypothesis at each school level (Table 8-4).

Table 8-3. The Relationship between Teacher Loyalty to Principals and Their Conformity to Self-Expectations to Involve Parents in School Affairs, by School Level
(Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	r	N
Elementary	.31*	97
Junior High	.13	48
Senior High	.32*	78

* $p < .05$; one-tailed test.

Table 8-4. The Relationship between Teacher Satisfaction with Principals' Leadership and Their Conformity to Self-Expectations to Involve Parents in School Affairs, by School Level (Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	r	N
Elementary	.23*	105
Junior High	.26*	57
Senior High	.32*	79

* $p < .05$; one-tailed test.

Higher Administrator Characteristics

Higher Administrator Expectations

There is good reason to believe that the expectations of higher administrators can play a part in reducing the risks confronting a principal predisposed to invite the participation of parents in school activities. First, if the superiors of a principal hold a negative orientation to parent participation, and the principal encourages such involvement, then he would be assuming the risk of reducing his chances of advancing in his educational career to the extent that he is dependent on his superiors' help and sponsorship.

Second, when a principal acts according to his own expectations and also conforms to general policies of the school system (as indicated by the expectations his superiors hold for him), the risks incurred within his school can be compensated to some extent by the knowledge that he is doing what he is supposed to do as a representative of the larger system. Third, if there is teacher resistance, he has someone to blame; he can explain to his teachers, who may resent his actions, that he has little or no choice in the matter. Thus, he can reduce his risks by claiming that the impetus for his actions comes from the central office. We hypothesize, therefore, that the stronger the expectations of his administrative superiors that he involve parents, the more the principal will engage in this activity in accord with his own expectations.

We have earlier described (Chapter Three) the procedures used to measure the expectations of higher administrators for principals' performance. The items used in computing the expectation scores in the

area of parental involvement were presented in Table 3-3. When we related the expectation scores of higher administrators to the principals' role performance scores on parental involvement, we found support for the hypothesis only at the junior high school level (Table 8-5).

What accounts for the conditional nature of the findings? The explanation we suggest is as follows: parent involvement in school affairs is probably a more risky venture for the junior high principal than for his elementary and senior high school counterparts. In the junior high school a formal decision is made affecting the curriculum placement of pupils. Judgments must be made as to which pupils will enter the college preparatory curriculum and which will enter some other curriculum that does not lead to college. The importance of these decisions has become magnified over the last decade, and parents have become increasingly concerned not only about the fate of their own children but about whether the school itself is offering the appropriate instruction for the talented pupil and -- perhaps just as intensely -- for the not-so-talented pupil. Under these circumstances, junior high principals can become subjected to inordinate parental pressures, often of a special pleading nature when parents are centrally involved in school affairs.

At the senior high school level, principals face less risk from parental involvement because decisions about the curriculum in which pupils are placed have already been made, and the greater academic preparation of teachers make parents more reluctant to challenge their teaching activities.

In the case of the elementary schools, it is generally accepted by

Table 8-5. The Relationship between Higher Administrator Expectations for Involvement of Parents in School Affairs and Principals' Conformity to Self-Expectations in This Area, by School Level (Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	<u>r</u>	N
Elementary	.12	95
Junior High	.22*	56
Senior High	.04	77

* $p < .05$; one-tailed test.

both teachers and principals that parents have a right to participate in school affairs as indicated by the flourishing of parent-teacher associations at this level more than at the other two. Thus, in so far as parental involvement is considered relatively desirable at the elementary level, this fact in itself suggests that the principals' efforts to involve parents are less risky.

Principal Characteristics

In this section of the chapter, we concern ourselves with characteristics of the principal that may influence his conformity to self-expectations and with overriding considerations according to which he may act, whatever the risks involved.

Dealing with the Community

There is a strong ideological tradition in the United States favoring the local control of schools which is based on the premise that school policy should be responsive to the interests and unique problems of communities. Though schools may serve local interests, communities are seldom of one piece; even in relatively circumscribed areas, one often finds marked differences among residents based on ethnicity, social class, religion, duration of residence, and so on, differences that may result in conflicting demands upon the schools. If principals invite the participation of parents in school affairs, they may at the same time create conditions under which the lines of community cleavage become explicit and find themselves caught in the crossfire of conflicting

demands upon the schools that cannot easily be reconciled. The content of the ideology notwithstanding, the principals' attempts to serve the interests of the community may be highly risky ventures and perhaps impossible tasks.

As we noted earlier, the principal may have to cope with resentment originating in his own faculty as a consequence of his soliciting the contributions of laymen on school matters as well as to face the risks that arise from his own direct confrontation with dissident elements in the school community. The inherent dangers in encouraging parental participation, however, may be mitigated if the principal has the social and political acumen to cope with them. If he is highly skilled in dealing with parents, he will be able to prevent parental pressures and criticisms that may lead to teacher resentment and to difficulties for himself. Thus, we hypothesize that the greater the principal's skill in dealing with the community, the more he acts according to his own expectation to involve parents in school affairs.

We have reported earlier (Chapter Seven, pp. 7-31 -- 7-32) the way we measured the principals' skill in dealing with the community. When we related this index to the principals' behavior scores on involvement of parents in school affairs, the findings supported our hypothesis at each school level (Table 8-6).

Sharing of Responsibility with Teachers

There are several aspects of shared responsibility between principal and teachers bearing on risks involved in inviting parental participation in school affairs. First, by including teachers in the policy-making

Table 8-6. The Relationship between Principals' Skill in Dealing with the Community and Their Conformity to Self-Expectations to Involve Parents in School Affairs, by School Level (Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	<u>r</u>	N
Elementary	.39*	104
Junior High	.25*	57
Senior High	.41*	79

* $p < .05$; one-tailed test.

process, the principal provides opportunities for them to express their ideas and interests about matters of direct concern to their work and about general school policy. To the extent that the sharing of responsibility occurs over a broad range of school issues, teachers, by implication have the opportunity to make themselves heard on questions pertaining to the frequency and nature of their contact with parents. According to this line of reasoning, the principal can reduce the risks he must confront over the issue of parental participation by taking into consideration directly the interests of teachers whose work is directly affected by his action.

Second, by sharing responsibility with his staff, the principal is able to locate himself at a crucial juncture: namely, at a point where he can interpret matters of school policy and teacher interests to parents. In turn, he can interpret the sentiments of community members to teachers while at the same time obviating a potential clash of interests that might develop out of a direct confrontation of parents and teachers over particularly controversial questions. While the principal puts himself at the center of the crossfire, he also places himself strategically as a mediator between two important groups of people each of whom may hold different ideas about what the school should accomplish and how. It is his occupancy of this strategic location, we contend, that represents a risk-reducing resource for the principal.

Third, teachers may well recognize the legitimacy of parents' interests not only in their particular children but in the general adequacy of the school program; yet, at the same time, they need some guarantee

that their own concerns will be taken into account, that their interests be protected. Thus, if the principal provides some mechanisms for the expression of teacher interests, such as his willingness to involve them in defining school policy, he diminishes the risks he must face by offering his faculty a guid for the quo of parental involvement.

All three lines of argument, therefore, suggest the hypothesis that the more a principal shares responsibility with his teachers in matters of school policy, the more likely he acts according to his own predisposition to involve parents in school affairs.

Using the measures of "sharing responsibility" presented earlier in Chapter Six, pp. 6-30 -- 6-31, we find general support for the hypothesis. Of the 12 correlation coefficients, all are in the predicted direction and 10 of them are significant statistically at below the .05 level (Table 8-7).

Principals' Skills: Human Relations

We have already spoken about the principal's skill in dealing with the community; we are concerned here with a different and more general kind of skill: his ability to deal with people. If he is highly skilled in this respect, this fact in itself is a source of risk reduction for him. He can engage in a potentially disruptive activity on the assumption that he can cope with its attendant human relations problems. Thus, we hypothesize that the greater the principal's competence in the area of human relations, the more he acts in accord with his self-expectations to involve parents in school affairs.

When we tested this hypothesis with our index of the principal's

Table 8-7. The Relationship between the Involvement of Teachers in Four Decision Areas and Principals' Conformity to Self-Expectations to Involve Parents in School Affairs, by School Level (Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	<u>r</u>	<u>N</u>
<u>Pupil Performance</u>		
Elementary	.26*	105
Junior High	.39*	57
Senior High	.28*	79
<u>School Evaluation</u>		
Elementary	.37*	105
Junior High	.37*	57
Senior High	.24*	79
<u>Teacher Evaluation</u>		
Elementary	.34*	105
Junior High	.13	57
Senior High	.24*	79
<u>Discipline Policy</u>		
Elementary	.18*	105
Junior High	.20	57
Senior High	.27*	79

* $p < .05$; one-tailed test.

skills in human relations (see Chapter Six, p. 6-34, for our measurement procedures), the results indicated support our hypothesis at each school level (Table 8-8).

Principal Self-expectations

Having discussed those characteristics and actions of the principal that can be considered personal resources -- conditions for reducing the intensity of risk in the work setting -- we turn in the remainder of this chapter to characteristics of a more ideological cast representing over-riding considerations. These characteristics, we maintain, can be considered as convictions that if held with sufficient intensity will predispose the principal to accept the riskiness of his situation at whatever extent it exists and act anyway in line with his beliefs about what he thinks is the right thing to do.

In regard to the expectations that principals hold for themselves, the same argument employed in the preceding chapter pertains here as well. Among principals already disposed to encouraging the participation of parents in school affairs, we hypothesize that those whose convictions in the matter are more strongly held will engage in the activity more than those whose convictions are less strongly held.

To measure the degree of intensity of the principals' self-expectation to involve parents in school affairs, we used their self-expectation scores, the measurement of which was described in Chapter Three. The findings bearing on our hypothesis appear in Table 8-9 and indicate support for it at each school level.

Table 8-8. The Relationship between Teacher Evaluation of Principals' Skills in the Area of Human Relations and Their Conformity to Self-Expectations to Involve Parents in School Affairs, by School Level (Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	<u>r</u>	N
Elementary	.28*	105
Junior High	.22*	57
Senior High	.28*	79

* $p < .05$; one-tailed test.

Table 8-9. The Relationship between Principal Self-Expectations to Involve Parents in School Affairs and Conformity to Them, by School Level (Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	<u>r</u>	N
Elementary	.45*	105
Junior High	.37*	57
Senior High	.62*	79

* $p < .05$; one-tailed test.

Criteria for Evaluating Schools: Pupils' Social and Emotional Development, Pupils' Academic Achievement

The leadership functions of a principal require that he set goals for the school, assign priorities to them, and commit the available resources (personnel, money, time) toward their accomplishment. Defining goals, therefore, represents one way a principal expresses his conception of what the school, as an organizational entity, should do.

Social-emotional development and academic achievement are widely recognized as two of the most important goals of the public school and pertain in the most immediate way to the school's contribution to its clients, both pupils and their parents. Both goals are designed to maximize the welfare of pupils. Although the involvement of parents in school activities with respect to these objectives can lead to risks for principals, such involvement can also contribute to the accomplishment of the same objectives. We assume that the greater the principals' commitment to them, the more willingly they will encourage parental support despite the risks of inviting parental participation. Thus, we hypothesize that the more importance principals attribute to the goals of social-emotional development and academic achievement, the more they will act in accord with their self-expectations to encourage parental involvement.

The procedures used to measure the importance principals attribute to the goals of social-emotional development and academic achievement were as follows: in the course of their interviews, principals were asked about 25 distinct criteria for evaluating schools. The questions

was worded: "How much importance should be given to such a criterion?" The response categories were: "great," "some," "little," and "no importance." The items on the list were chosen to represent a variety of standards, two of which were social-emotional development and academic achievement. When the principals' responses to the questions were factor-analyzed, two of the five emerging factors did appear to reflect these two criteria. Scores indicating the importance each principal assigned to these two criteria were then computed, each calculated from the weights derived from the loadings of items included in the factors. The items included in each factor were as follows:

Social-emotional Factor

1. The degree to which students exhibit emotional maturity.
2. The degree to which students exhibit social maturity.
3. The degree of tolerance toward fellow students of differing social backgrounds.

Academic Achievement Factor

1. The success of former students in whatever educational institution they go to next.
2. The proportion of students who eventually go to college.
3. The degree of student mastery of subject matter fundamentals.
4. The achievement test scores of students.⁵

We used the factor scores as summary measures in the test of our hypothesis.

The results do not give general support for our hypothesis (Table 8-10). In regard to social-emotional development, there is support only at the elementary level; and in regard to academic achievement, only at the secondary levels. In both cases, the findings suggest the relevance of school level for specific phases of pupils' psychological development.

With respect to the social-emotional area, it seems that the principal acts according to the premise that one basic task of the elementary school is to get children to accept standards of behavior different from those prevailing at home. The learning of these standards, since they depart in good measure from those that children have experienced since earliest childhood, demands particular concern with the psychological problems that accompany the transition from one social institution to another, especially where the transition involves changes in the premises for behavior.⁶ Moreover, since the early years of schooling require that children be separated from the home for longer periods of time than heretofore, that they be placed in a more competitive situation where they are to an increasing degree held responsible individually -- without previously available supports -- for their performance, the principal may attempt to influence the home environment by encouraging parental participation so that parents will support the learning process as it occurs in school.

The more academic aspects of schooling, involving considerable emphasis on judging pupils according to both performance and universalistic standards, depend on children's first having established positive

Table 8-10. The Relationship between Principal Criteria for the Evaluation of Schools in the Areas of (A) Pupil Social-Emotional Development; (B) Pupil Academic Achievement and Conformity to Self-Expectations to Involve Parents in School Affairs, by School Level (Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	<u>r</u>	<u>N</u>
A. <u>Pupil Social-Emotional Development</u>		
Elementary	.24*	102
Junior High	.17	55
Senior High	-.16	78
B. <u>Pupil Academic Achievement</u>		
Elementary	.03	103
Junior High	.29*	56
Senior High	.19*	77

* $p < .05$; one-tailed test.

sentiments toward school and toward the rules of the game by which it operates. These aspects are more prominent in the secondary school program than in the elementary. In secondary schools the fact that each teacher faces many more pupils per day than his elementary counterpart and the fact that the higher level schools are more likely to be departmentalized by subject each militate against the teacher being able to serve the social and emotional needs of pupils to a degree comparable with the elementary teacher.

From the parent's perspective, we contend, there is a shift in the primary area of concern. At the elementary level, the social and emotional problems associated with the child's departure from home are most problematic; at the secondary levels, academic matters become more problematic than earlier with the imminence of the pupil's entrance into the job market and his attendance at college. Particularly for the pupil heading for college, academic achievement becomes a crucial issue both for him and his parents.

Our findings suggest, then, that the principal tends to involve parents when the educational process becomes especially problematic for pupils. The problematic issues, however, vary with the pupil's phase of development, and the phases correspond roughly to school level. In terms of the principal's coping with risks, there are at least two ways of viewing his problem. First, we can consider that the principal acts according to overriding concerns: the crucial problems for the elementary school's clients lie in the social-emotional area. He, therefore, brings in parents as one strategy for coping with these problems. At

the secondary levels, these client problems fall more in the academic achievement area; he involves parents accordingly. In both cases he acts according to the saliency of the problem and subordinates the question of the risks he must confront.

Second, we can also interpret our findings according to a risk-reduction argument. The principal increases his risks by failing to deal with critical problems confronting his clients -- the problems differing in nature depending on the level of school in question. If encouraging parental participation in school affairs creates risks vis-à-vis his staff, failing to cope with important problems of his clients also represents a source of risk; in order to reduce it, he invites the participation of parents as a means of coping with their problems and those of their children. A critical question for the principal, therefore, is one of coping with two problems the solutions to which are far from consistent.

Conflict between Pupil and Teacher Interests

In treating the problem of school goals in the previous section as conceived by principals, we found reason to believe that one source of risk in their jobs was the need to serve the potentially conflicting interests of teachers and clients; principals have important obligations to both. In this section, we deal more directly with this conflict and its bearing on principals' likelihood of encouraging the participation of parents in school affairs.

There are several activities in running a school whose nature is such that the principal must adopt a course of action that ostensibly

violates the interests either of pupils or of teachers. In a work situation where both clients and subordinates are strongly affected by the principal's action, and where their interests do not coincide, the element of risk confronting the principal is salient.

We assume that the principal's rationale for involving parents is that their participation will have positive educational effects despite the risks involved. One major risk, we have argued, is that teachers will resent parental involvement in activities affecting their work. If, however, the principal feels that his primary obligation is to his clients rather than his staff, then one can assume that he will be more willing to incur this risk. We hypothesize, therefore, that the higher the priority a principal gives to the interests of pupils over those of his teachers, the more he will conform to his self-expectation to involve parents.

The measure we used of the priority principals give to pupil over teacher interests was presented in Chapter Seven, pp. 7-35 -- 7-36.

The findings are in the direction predicted by the hypothesis at each school level and are significant statistically at below the .05 level for the elementary and senior high schools (Table 8-11).

Socio-economic Status of Schools

There is considerable empirical evidence indicating that interest in education, belief in its importance, and the evaluation of it as a good thing all vary directly with socio-economic status. It is reasonable to argue, therefore, that the higher the socio-economic level of

Table 8-11. The Relationship between Principal Priority Assigned to Pupil over Teacher Interests and Conformity to Self-Expectations to Involve Parents in School Affairs, by School Level (Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	<u>r</u>	<u>N</u>
Elementary	.18*	105
Junior High	.20	57
Senior High	.32*	79

* $p < .05$; one-tailed test.

the school district, the more likely there will be parents who are not only interested in what happens in the school but also who feel they have something important to say about what the school should accomplish and how it should be run.

If these contentions are correct, the higher the socio-economic status of the school community, the more the principal will be subjected to parental pressures. If he resists them, he runs the risks of losing community support for the school program and making himself the target of criticism. If, however, he encourages parental participation in school affairs and provides some arrangement by which parents can make their ideas, sentiments, and criticisms known, he increases his own opportunities to cope with parental pressures -- perhaps by coopting parents or by being responsive to their ideas and demands -- before they intensify to the point where he becomes ineffective as the executive officer of the school. We hypothesize, then, that the higher the socio-economic status of the school, the more likely the principal will encourage parental participation. The risks he faces originate in the community at large and take the form of parental pressure on the school. Under these circumstances, the risks do not arise from the effects of his behavior on his teachers, for they may be subjected to the same pressures that confront him. Given a threat that originates outside the school, there is much in common between the interests of the principal and those of his teachers; the encouragement of parental participation, then, represents one strategy of reducing the risks facing all school personnel.

Using the measure of the socio-economic status of schools presented in Chapter Seven, pp. 7-39 -- 7-40, we found support for the hypothesis at each level (Table 8-12).

Table 8-12. The Relationship between the Socio-Economic Status Score of Schools and Their Principals' Conformity to Self-Expectations to Involve Parents in School Affairs, by School Level (Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)

	<u>r</u>	<u>N</u>
Elementary	.22*	104
Junior High	.33*	57
Senior High	.21*	79

* $p < .05$; one-tailed test.

Notes and References for Chapter Eight

1. One can also make a case for pupils being the clients of the schools, but there is no need to decide whether pupils or parents are the "real" clients because both are. We are restricting our discussion here, however, to parents.

2. As the table below indicates, elementary principals involve parents in school affairs more than secondary principals; there is no significant difference between junior and senior high school principals.

School Level and Involvement of
Parents in School Affairs

	<u>$\bar{X}$</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>N</u>
Elementary	7.65	1.33	175
Junior High	6.63	1.32	135
Senior High	6.49	1.37	143

$$F_{2,450} = 36.00; p < .01$$

$$t_{(E-J)} = 6.73; p < .01$$

$$t_{(E-S)} = 7.65; p < .01$$

$$t_{(J-S)} = 0.87; n.s.$$

3. We know that on the average teachers tend to be somewhat more negatively than positively disposed toward principals' involvement of parents in school affairs, and more so at the elementary than at the secondary levels. We are concerned here, however, not with the general favorableness of their sentiments but with variations in that sentiment.

4. See Chapter Three, pp. 3-10 -- 3-19.

5. See Appendix B-12 for descriptions of the statistical properties of the social-emotional criterion measure and Appendix B-13 for the academic achievement criterion measure.

6. For example, in family units, there are more opportunities for adults to take into consideration the personal characteristics and idiosyncracies of children, to be freer in the expression of affection, to be less rigorous in the use of achievement standards for behavior than there are in schools.

Chapter 2: Summary

This investigation is concerned with the role behavior of school principals in the context of the organizations in which they work: the public schools. It is also concerned with a conceptual problem, that of developing a scheme by which the contributions of role analysis and the analysis of large-scale organizations can be brought together in a mutually relevant way. School principals occupy a social position -- the principalship -- found only in organizational settings. Their behavior, we contend, can be understood if we have knowledge of the personal characteristics they bring with them to their work, the position they occupy, and the structural properties of the organizations of which the position is a part.

We have sought the linkage between social roles and organizations in the concept of role behavior, activities that individuals perform by virtue of their occupying a social position. We view role behavior as a pattern of actions in which individuals cope with problematic issues inherent in organizational life. As discussed earlier in Chapter Two, there are many such issues; but we have directed our attention to three of them: principals' closeness of supervision, support of innovation, and involvement of parents in school affairs. We selected these three because they are critically important not only in the operation of schools but in the functioning of other organizations as well.

The empirical aspects of the investigation are in two parts. The first concerns the effects of principals' role behavior patterns on the overall operation of schools, in particular, teacher morale, teacher effort, and pupil academic performance. We address ourselves to the question of whether variations in role behavior are associated with variations in school

operation. The second concerns the determinants of role behavior patterns, specifically, whether variations in social and psychological conditions are related to the extent to which principals' role behavior patterns conform to the expectations that principals hold for themselves.

Along with our interest in the effects and determinants of role behavior patterns, we are concerned throughout with the possible impact of one contextual aspect of school organization: school level -- elementary, junior high, and senior high. The concept of level has been long neglected despite the widely recognized differences in organizational structure, clientele, district jurisdiction, social composition, and relationship with surrounding social institutions associated with schools at each level.

This investigation of role behavior represents one part of the National Principalship Study, a broader research enterprise concerned with a wide range of issues pertaining to school principals in large urban settings: American cities with populations of 50,000 and over. Data were obtained in 1960-1961 from 501 principals, 172 higher administrators based in the central offices of school systems, and 3,367 teachers selected randomly from each school whose principal was drawn into the sample, in 41 cities. The sample of principals was stratified according to school level, per-pupil expenditure, size of city population, and region.

In the following pages, we present in summary form the empirical findings of this particular investigation of principals' role behavior.

Teacher Morale: The Effects of Principals' Role Behavior on the Operation of Their Schools

1. Principals' closeness of supervision: positive relationships¹ at the junior and senior high school levels; no relationship at the elementary school level.
2. Principals' support of innovation: positive relationship at each school level.
3. Principals' involvement of parents in school affairs: positive relationship at each school level.

Teacher Effort: The Effects of Principals' Role Behavior on the Operation of Their Schools

1. Principals' closeness of supervision: positive relationship at each school level.
2. Principals' support of innovation: positive relationship at each school level.
3. Principals' involvement of parents in school affairs: positive relationship at each school level.

Pupil Academic Achievement: The Effects of Principals' Role Behavior on The Operation of Their Schools

1. Principals' closeness of supervision: positive relationship at each school level (socio-economic status of schools held constant by partial correlation).
2. Principals' support of innovation: positive relationship at the junior high school level; no relationships at the elementary and senior high school levels (socio-economic status of schools held constant by partial correlation).

3. Principals' involvement of parents in school affairs: positive relationship at the junior high school level; no relationships at the elementary and senior high school levels (socio-economic status of schools held constant by partial correlation).

Closeness of Supervision: Determinants of Principals' Conformity to Self-Expectations

1. Teachers' expectations for principals' closeness of supervision: positive relationship at each school level.

2. Teachers' competence as measured by the per cent of teachers holding the Master's or higher academic degree within each school: positive relationships at the elementary and junior high school levels; no relationship at the senior high school level.

3. Teachers' competence as measured by the principals' estimates of the per cent of their teachers who competently carry out their teaching assignments: no relationships at the elementary and junior high school levels; negative relationship at the senior high school level.

4. Teachers' loyalty to the principal: no relationship at the elementary school level; positive relationships at the junior and senior high school levels.

5. Teachers' satisfaction with the principals' leadership: positive relationship at each school level.

6. Higher administrators' expectations for principals' closeness of supervision: positive relationship at the elementary school level; no relationships at the junior and senior high school levels.

7. Extent to which principals are allowed by the higher administration to evaluate teaching applicants being considered for appointment to their schools: no relationship at any school level.

8. Principals' self-expectations for closeness of supervision: positive relationships at the elementary and senior high school levels; no relationship at the junior high school level.

9. Principals' involvement of teachers in four decision areas: (a) pupil performance: positive relationship at each school level; (b) school evaluation: positive relationship at each school level; (c) teacher evaluation: no relationship at any school level; (d) discipline policy: positive relationship at each school level.

10. Teachers' evaluation of principals' skills in the area of instructional leadership: positive relationship at each school level.

11. Teachers' evaluation of principals' skills in the area of human relations: positive relationship at each school level.

12. School size: no relationship at any school level.

13. Variance of teacher age: no relationship at any school level.

Support of Innovation: Determinants of Principals' Conformity to Self-Expectations

1. Teachers' expectations for principals' support of innovation: positive relationship at each school level.

2. Teachers' competence as measured by the principals' estimates of the per cent of their teachers who competently carry out their teaching assignments: no relationship at any school level.

3. Teachers' loyalty to the principal: positive relationship at each school level.

4. Higher administrators' expectations for principals' support of innovation: no relationships at the elementary and junior high school levels; positive relationship at the senior high school level.

5. Extent to which principals are allowed by the higher administration to evaluate teaching applicants being considered for appointment to their schools: positive relationship at the elementary school level; no relationships at the junior and senior high school levels.

6. Principals' age: negative relationships at the elementary and senior high school levels; no relationship at the junior high school level.

7. Principals' authoritarianism: negative relationships at the elementary and junior high school levels; no relationship at the senior high school level.

8. Number of years principals have spent as classroom teachers: negative relationships at the elementary and junior high school levels; no relationship at the senior high school level.

9. Teachers' evaluation of principals' skills in the area of instructional leadership: positive relationship at each school level.

10. Teachers' evaluation of principals' skills in the area of human relations: positive relationship at each school level.

11. Principals' involvement of teachers in four decision areas: (a) pupil performance: positive relationship at each school level; (b) school evaluation: positive relationship at each school level; (c) teacher

evaluation: positive relationship at each school level; (d) discipline policy: positive relationship at each school level.

12. Principals' involvement of parents in school affairs: positive relationship at each school level.

13. Principals' skill in dealing with the community: positive relationship at each school level.

14. Principals' self-expectations for support of innovation: positive relationship at each school level.

15. Principals' priority assigned to pupil over teacher interests: positive relationship at each school level.

16. Socio-economic status of schools: no relationship at any school level.

Involvement of Parents in School Affairs: Determinants of Principals' Conformity to Self-Expectations

1. Teachers' expectations for principals' involvement of parents in school affairs: positive relationship at each school level.

2. Teachers' competence as measured by the per cent of teachers holding the Master's or higher academic degree within each school: no relationship at any school level.

3. Teachers' loyalty to the principal: positive relationships at the elementary and senior high school levels; no relationship at the junior high school level.

4. Teachers' satisfaction with the principals' leadership: positive relationship at each school level.

5. Higher administrators' expectations for principals' involvement of parents in school affairs: positive relationship at the junior high

school level; no relationships at the elementary and senior high school levels.

6. Principals' skill in dealing with the community: positive relationship at each school level.

7. Principals' involvement of teachers in four decision areas: (a) pupil performance: positive relationship at each school level; (b) school evaluation: positive relationship at each school level; (c) teacher evaluation: positive relationships at the elementary and senior high school levels; no relationship at the junior high school level; (d) discipline policy: positive relationships at the elementary and senior high school levels, no relationship at the junior high school level.

8. Teachers' evaluation of principals' skills in the area of human relations: positive relationship at each school level.

9. Principals' self-expectations for involvement of parents in school affairs: positive relationship at each school level.

10. Principals' criteria for evaluating schools in the area of pupil social-emotional development: positive relationship at the elementary level; no relationships at the junior and senior high school levels.

11. Principals' criteria for evaluating schools in the area of pupil academic achievement: positive relationships at the junior and senior high school levels; no relationship at the elementary school level.

12. Principals' priority assigned to pupil over teacher interests: positive relationships at the elementary and senior high school levels; no relationship at the junior high school level.

13. Socio-economic status of schools: positive relationship at each school level.

Notes and References for Chapter Nine

1. The statement that there is a relationship refers to a zero-order Pearsonian Correlation Coefficient, positive or negative in direction, at or below the .05 level of significance.

Appendix A: Specimen Questionnaires

A-2

A-1: Section of the Teacher Questionnaire Used to Obtain Descriptions
of the Principals' Role Behavior

Instructions		Col. I	Col. II
Listed below are some activities in which a PRINCIPAL can engage. Please answer Question 3 and Question 4 by writing in Col. I the <u>LETTER</u> and in Col. II the <u>NUMBER</u> which best represent your replies.			
Question 3 Do you feel the <u>PRINCIPAL OF YOUR SCHOOL</u> should engage in the following activities? I feel that the principal of my school. . . A = Absolutely must B = Preferably should C = May or may not D = Preferably should not E = Absolutely must not N = This activity not relevant to my school	Question 4 How frequently does your principal do this? My principal. . . does this. 1 = Always 2 = Almost always 3 = Occasionally 4 = Almost never 5 = Never N = This activity not relevant to my school		
22. Encourage interested parent groups to evaluate how well the school is achieving its curricular objectives.		☐	☐
24. Attempt to "redirect" the activities of the PTA or similar organizations that are beginning to question school practices.		☐	☐
25. Use interested parents as volunteer part-time "teacher helpers."		☐	☐
11. Give additional free time to teachers who are trying out new ideas in their classes.		☐	☐
13. Attempt to secure teachers in the school who are interested in experimenting with new educational ideas.		☐	☐
14. Encourage the introduction of curricular changes which he believes in even though there is little proof that the new curriculum will do a better job than the old one.		☐	☐
15. Encourage the staff to learn about and try out some of the "new ideas" coming from schools of education.		☐	☐
16. Encourage teachers to consider adopting new educational ideas which have been tried out in other communities and found to be successful.		☐	☐
17. Resist the introduction of a new educational method when he believes the current method is reasonably satisfactory.		☐	☐
18. Go slowly in introducing new techniques recommended by curriculum specialists.		☐	☐
19. Encourage schools of education to conduct experimental research in the school.		☐	☐
13. Use interested parents as an advisory group when making out the course of study.		☐	☐
14. Attempt to restrict as much as possible the part parents play in school affairs.		☐	☐
16. Discourage parental questioning of educational beliefs of faculty members.		☐	☐
17. Encourage a group of parents to discuss and help formulate the educational philosophy to be used in the school.		☐	☐
18. Encourage parental attendance at school assemblies.		☐	☐
20. Encourage parents to help during school hours on school or class trips or projects.		☐	☐
21. Devote considerable effort to developing or maintaining an active parents' organization in his school.		☐	☐

	Col. I	Col. II
20. Make only those changes in teaching methods which are being introduced on a systemwide basis.	☐	☐
	XX	XX
23. Seek out new ideas to introduce into the school's program.	☐	☐
-----	(815)	(816)
11. Closely supervise new teachers in the school.	☐	☐
12. Require that teachers' classroom behavior conform to the principal's standards.	☐	☐
13. Visit classes on a regular schedule to determine how well teachers are carrying out their jobs.	☐	☐
	XX	XX
16. Check to see that teachers prepare written lesson plans.	☐	☐
17. Ask teachers to report all major conferences with parents to the principal.	☐	☐
	X	X
19. Closely direct the work of teachers who are likely to experience difficulty.	☐	☐
20. Require that teachers discuss their major classroom problems with the principal.	☐	☐
21. Limit supervisory activities primarily to those teachers with classroom problems.	☐	☐
22. Know what is taking place in most classrooms during most of the day.	☐	☐
	XXX	XXX
26. Require teachers to keep the principal informed about "problem" children in their classrooms.	☐	☐
	X	X
28. Determine what the objectives of the guidance program should be in the school.	☐	☐

A-2: Section of the Teacher Questionnaire Used to Obtain Measures of
Pupil Academic Performance, Teacher Morale, Teacher Effort,
and Teacher Loyalty

Below you are being requested to furnish information about your students, their parents, and your fellow teachers. We ask that you provide this information in the form of percentages, although we know it is difficult to give exact percentages for most of the questions. Please write in your SINGLE BEST ESTIMATE of the percentage that you feel most accurately reflects your situation.

- | | |
|---|---------|
| A. Of the <u>STUDENTS</u> you teach, what <u>per cent.</u> . . | (846) |
| 11. Are <u>not</u> interested in academic achievement? | _____ % |
| 13. Have been discipline problems during the last school year? | _____ % |
| 15. Work up to their intellectual capacities? | _____ % |
| 17. Were not adequately prepared to do the grade level work you expected of them when they entered your class (or classes)? | _____ % |
| 19. Have engaged in vandalism at school during the current school year? | _____ % |
| 21. Show a sense of self-discipline? | _____ % |
| 23. Show disrespect for teachers? | _____ % |
| 25. Are tolerant toward fellow students with different social backgrounds? | _____ % |
| 27. Appear <u>emotionally</u> immature for their age? | _____ % |
| 29. Appear <u>socially</u> immature for their age? | _____ % |
| 31. Will eventually go on to a four year college? | _____ % |
| 33. Are one or more years behind grade level in reading ability? | _____ % |
| 35. Are not mastering the subject matter or skills you teach at the minimum level of satisfactory performance? | _____ % |

C. Of the TEACHERS in your school, what per cent. . .

(847)

- | | |
|--|--------|
| 11. Display a sense of loyalty to the school? | _____% |
| 13. Enjoy working in the school? | _____% |
| 15. Respect the judgment of the administrators of the school? | _____% |
| 17. Work cooperatively with their fellow teachers? | _____% |
| 19. Display a sense of pride in the school? | _____% |
| 21. Accept the educational philosophy underlying the curriculum of the school? | _____% |
| 23. Try new teaching methods in their classrooms? | _____% |
| 25. Waste a lot of time in their classroom activities? | _____% |
| 27. Do everything possible to motivate their students? | _____% |
| 29. Maintain effective discipline in their classes? | _____% |
| 31. Maintain a professional attitude towards their work? | _____% |
| 33. Do "textbook teaching" only? | _____% |
| 35. Usually "drag their feet" when new ideas are introduced into the school program? | _____% |
| 37. Take a strong interest in the social or emotional problems of their students? | _____% |
| 39. Maintain an interest in improving the educational program of the school? | _____% |
| 41. Are committed to doing the best job of which they are capable? | _____% |
| 43. Have a sense of personal loyalty to the principal? | _____% |
| 45. Plan their classes so that different types of students can benefit from them? | _____% |
| 47. Provide opportunities for students to go beyond the minimum demands of assigned work? | _____% |
| 49. Would stand behind the principal if he were unfairly criticized by a group of parents? | _____% |
| 51. Support the principal when he is being criticized by elements in the community? | _____% |
| 53. Support the principal when he is under pressure from the higher administration of the school system? | _____% |
| 55. Willingly contribute some extra time in working on a new program that the principal feels will benefit the students? | _____% |
-

A-3: Section of the Principal Role Questionnaire Used to Obtain Self-
Expectations for Behavior

Instructions

Listed below are some activities in which a principal can engage. Please answer Question 5 and Question 6 by circling the letter and number which best represent your replies.

Question 5

What obligation do you feel as PRINCIPAL of your school to do the following activities?

I feel that as principal of this school I. . . .


- A = Absolutely must
 B = Preferably should
 C = May or may not
 D = Preferably should not
 E = Absolutely must not
 N = This activity not relevant to my particular situation

Activities

1. Discourage parents from telephoning the principal at home in evenings or on weekends.

A B C D E N

2. Permit parents to visit classrooms unannounced during regular school hours.

A B C D E N

3. Use interested parents as an advisory group when making out the course of study.

A B C D E N

4. Attempt to restrict as much as possible the part the parents play in school affairs.

A B C D E N

5. Give considerable weight to parental wishes and desires when placing a student in a particular class or program.

A B C D E N

6. Discourage parental questioning of educational beliefs of faculty members.

A B C D E N

7. Encourage a group of parents to discuss and help formulate the educational philosophy to be used in the school.

A B C D E N

Please continue answering Questions 5 and 6.	<u>Question 5</u> What obligation do you feel as <u>PRINCIPAL</u> of <u>your school</u> to do the following activities? I feel that as principal of this school I. A = Absolutely must B = Preferably should C = May or may not D = Preferably should not E = Absolutely must not N = This activity not relevant to my particular situation	
8. Encourage parental attendance at school assemblies. 9. Establish the policy that when parents are needed they will be sent for; that is, "don't call us, we'll call you." 10. Encourage parents to help during school hours on school or class trips or projects. 11. Devote considerable effort to developing or maintaining an active parents' organization in his school. 12. Encourage interested parent groups to evaluate how well the school is achieving its curricular objectives. 13. Establish the policy that parents may have access to the principal at all times during the school day.	A B C D E N A B C D E N A B C D E N A B C D E N A B C D E N A B C D E N	

Question 5

What obligation do you feel as PRINCIPAL of your school to do the following activities?

I feel that as principal of this school I. . .



- A = Absolutely must
- B = Preferably should
- C = May or may not
- D = Preferably should not
- E = Absolutely must not
- N = This activity not relevant to my particular situation

Please continue answering Questions 5 and 6.

14. Attempt to "redirect" the activities of the PTA or similar organizations that are beginning to question school practices.

A B C D E N

15. Use interested parents as volunteer part-time "teacher helpers."

A B C D E N

16. Discourage parents from coming to the school without first notifying the office of the purpose of their visit.

A B C D E N

 17. Give additional free time to teachers who are trying out new ideas in their classes.

A B C D E N

18. Insist that educational experimentation has no place in the public schools.

A B C D E N

19. Attempt to secure teachers in the school who are interested in experimenting with new educational ideas.

A B C D E N

20. Encourage the introduction of curricular changes which he believes in even though there is little proof that the new curriculum will do a better job than the old one.	A	B	C	D	E	N
21. Encourage the staff to learn about and try out some of the "new ideas" coming from schools of education.	A	B	C	D	E	N
22. Encourage teachers to consider adopting new educational ideas which have been tried out in other communities and found to be successful.	A	B	C	D	E	N
23. Resist the introduction of a new educational method when he believes the current method is reasonably satisfactory.	A	B	C	D	E	N
24. Go slowly in introducing new techniques recommended by curriculum specialists.	A	B	C	D	E	N
25. Encourage schools of education to conduct experimental research in the school.	A	B	C	D	E	N
26. Make only those changes in teaching methods which are being introduced on a system-wide basis.	A	B	C	D	E	N
27. Refuse to subject pupils to major changes in curriculum unless the new curriculum has been tried out in other schools and found to be successful.	A	B	C	D	E	N
28. Permit the use of only those teaching methods which he <u>personally</u> believes to be most effective.	A	B	C	D	E	N

29. Seek out new ideas to introduce into the school's program.	A	B	C	D	E	N
30. Support the adoption of only those major curriculum changes which are desired by a majority of the teachers concerned.	A	B	C	D	E	N

31. Closely supervise new teachers in the school.	A	B	C	D	E	N
32. Require that teachers' classroom behavior conform to the principal's standards.	A	B	C	D	E	N
33. Visit classes on a regular schedule to determine how well teachers are carrying out their jobs.	A	B	C	D	E	N
34. Allow teachers a great deal of freedom in the way they teach.	A	B	C	D	E	N
35. Make suggestions to teachers rather than give them directions.	A	B	C	D	E	N
36. Check to see that teachers prepare written lesson plans.	A	B	C	D	E	N
37. Ask teachers to report all major conferences with parents to the principal.	A	B	C	D	E	N
38. Make classroom observations only when the teachers request it.	A	B	C	D	E	N
39. Closely direct the work of teachers who are likely to experience difficulty.	A	B	C	D	E	N
40. Require that teachers discuss their major classroom problems with the principal.	A	B	C	D	E	N

41. Limit supervisory activities primarily to those teachers with classroom problems.	A	B	C	D	E	N
42. Know what is taking place in most classrooms during most of the day.	A	B	C	D	E	N
43. Encourage teachers to take considerable initiative in introducing new teaching materials to their classes.	A	B	C	D	E	N
44. Grant teachers considerable freedom in the grouping methods they use in their classrooms.	A	B	C	D	E	N
45. Let the administrative assistants decide what tasks should and should not be included in their jobs.	A	B	C	D	E	N
46. Require teachers to keep the principal informed of "problem" children in their classrooms.	A	B	C	D	E	N
47. Insist that teachers consult the principal prior to taking problems to higher authorities in the school system.	A	B	C	D	E	N
48. Determine what the objectives of the guidance program should be in the school.	A	B	C	D	E	N
49. Allow guidance staff members working in the school to determine how to allocate their own time.	A	B	C	D	E	N
50. Supervise closely the work of the school custodian or custodial staff.	A	B	C	D	E	N
51. Allow a teachers' committee to assist in preparing the agenda for faculty meetings.	A	B	C	D	E	N

52. Avoid checking on what
teachers are doing unless
there is a complaint.

A B C D E N

A-4: Section of the Interview Schedule Used to Measure Principals'

Criteria for Evaluating Schools

Please turn to Page B*. (Direct respondent to Page B in the notebook) Assume that some other committee members have prepared other criteria. I am going to read a series of possible other criteria and for each I would like you to answer Questions 1 and 2. That is, I would like you to tell me "Whether you feel this is a legitimate criterion for evaluating the school" and "How much importance should be given to such a criterion."

	(1)	(2)
1. The degree of parental cooperation with the school.	_____	_____
2. The achievement test scores of students.	_____	_____
3. The won-lost records of the school's athletic teams.	_____	_____
4. The degree to which students work up to their capacities.	_____	_____
5. The amount of student truancy.	_____	_____
6. The drop-out rate in the school.	_____	_____
7. The degree to which special provisions are made for the "gifted child."	_____	_____
8. The proportion of students who eventually go on to college.	_____	_____
9. The success of former students in whatever educational institution they go to next.	_____	_____
10. The amount of teacher turnover.	_____	_____
11. The morale of the teachers in the school.	_____	_____
12. The degree to which new teaching methods are being tried out in the school.	_____	_____

*For the contents of Page B, see page A-19 below.

	(1)	(2)
13. The degree to which special provisions are made for the "slow learner."	_____	_____
14. The degree to which teaching materials in addition to text books are being used.	_____	_____
15. The degree to which students exhibit <u>social</u> maturity.	_____	_____
16. The degree to which students exhibit <u>emotional</u> maturity.	_____	_____
17. The degree to which students have respect for the teachers.	_____	_____
18. The degree to which teachers are able to maintain discipline in their classes.	_____	_____
19. The degree to which students exercise self-discipline.	_____	_____
20. The proportion of students who are constant discipline problems.	_____	_____
21. The proportion of students who have efficient study habits.	_____	_____
22. The degree of tolerance toward fellow students of differing social backgrounds exhibited by students.	_____	_____
23. The proportion of students who cheat.	_____	_____
24. The degree of student mastery of subject matter fundamentals.	_____	_____
25. The proportion of students engaging in vandalism.	_____	_____

Categories Used by Principals Responding to Criteria They Would Use in Evaluating Schools

<u>Question 1</u> Is this a legitimate criterion for evaluating the school?	<u>Question 2</u> In evaluating the school how much importance should be given to such a criterion?
A = Yes B = No	1 = Great importance 2 = Some importance 3 = Little importance 4 = No importance N = Not relevant as a criterion

Appendix B: Guttman Scales and Factor Weights Used in the Measurement of Variables

This appendix deals with the technical details of scale and factor scoring for the development of indices. For the two Guttman scales (Teachers' Satisfaction with the Principals' Leadership and Principals' Skill in Dealing with the Community), we present the item number (as it appears in the questionnaire), the definition of a positive response, the per cent of positive responses, the frequency and per cent of item error, and the coefficient of chance reproducibility. Due to space limitations we do not report the breakdown of the error into its positive and negative components, although it was done and considered in developing all scales. We also present the number and per cent of cases assigned to each perfect scale type. Similarly, no report of the distribution of nonscale types appears here, although they were tallied and checked for evidence of nonrandomness.

For summary measures based on factor analyses, we present the item wording, means, standard deviations, and weights used in deriving summary scores; three types of scores based on factor analyses were used.

The first was based on factor analyses of principals' responses to questions (items); the resulting factor weights (item loadings) were then used to obtain summary scores representing characteristics of principals (Self-Expectations, Criteria for Evaluating Schools, Authoritarian Values; the same application of factor weights was used to obtain School Socio-Economic Status Scores, a measure characterizing the principal's school).

The second was based on factor analyses of principals' responses to obtain weights for developing indices of teacher characteristics (Expectations for Principals' Role Behavior), indices of principals' behavior based upon teacher observations (Principals' Role Behavior, Principals' Skill in Instructional Leadership, and Principals' Skill in Human Relations), and indices of higher administrator characteristics (Expectations for Principals' Role Behavior).

We adopted this unconventional procedure because we collected data from three distinct samples of school personnel (principals, their immediate administrative superiors, and teachers); there was no guarantee that had we summarized the responses of persons in these three categories of positions the summaries would have contained the same items and comparable factor weights. Since a prime concern of the study was the comparison of principals' self-expectations and behavior, in developing summary scores for behavior we applied item means, standard deviations, and weights derived from factor analyses of principals' self-expectations to teacher responses since teachers provided the observations necessary for measuring principal behavior. Each teacher could then be assigned a score calculated on the basis of his responses to all items comprising the measure with their respective factor weights. These teacher scores were then summarized by averaging them across the four to ten teacher-observers within each school. By using this procedure, we made the operational definition of all summary measures based on a given set of items identical.

The third use of factor analytic weights involved the summarization

of teacher data where no corresponding principal responses were available. In these cases, teacher responses were summarized for each school in which there were from four to ten respondents yielding a school mean; these summaries are called Average Reports and represent school properties. The Reports were then factor analyzed, the resulting weights being applied to each item. The weighted items were then added to obtain school scores (Teacher Morale, Teacher Effort, Pupil Academic Performance, Teacher Loyalty), all of which are treated in this study as organizational properties of schools based on the aggregation of individual responses.

B-1. Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Averaged Reports¹ of Teachers within Each of 441 Schools for Computing the Teachers' Morale Score

Question: Of the teachers in your school, what per cent. . . .

Item	Mean of Averaged Reports	Standard Deviation of Averaged Reports	Factor Weights
19. Display a sense of pride in the school.	80.0	14.0	.86
13. Enjoy working in the school.	79.5	13.6	.82
11. Display a sense of loyalty to the school.	82.5	11.8	.82
15. Respect the judgment of the administrators of the school.	76.1	14.8	.78
21. Accept the educational philosophy underlying the curriculum of the school.	82.1	11.2	.75
17. Work cooperatively with their fellow teachers.	84.7	8.5	.69

¹For each item, the Averaged Reports consist of the mean of teacher responses to that item calculated within each school.

B-2. Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Averaged Reports¹ of Teachers within Each of 442 Schools for Computing the Teachers' Effort Score

Question: Of the teachers in your school, what per cent. . . .

Item	Mean of Averaged Reports	Standard Deviation of Averaged Reports	Factor Weights
41. Are committed to doing the best job of which they are capable.	78.6	11.8	.81
31. Maintain a professional attitude toward their work.	81.3	9.7	.80
39. Maintain an interest in improving the educational program of the school.	73.0	14.7	.80
29. Maintain effective discipline in their classes.	80.5	9.5	.69
23. Try new teaching methods in their classrooms.	59.6	16.4	.66
25. Waste a lot of time in their classroom activities.	18.9	11.1	-.60
33. Do "testbook" teaching only.	24.7	13.6	-.66
35. Usually "drag their feet" when new ideas are introduced into the school program.	22.9	11.4	-.69

¹For each item, the Averaged Reports consist of the mean of teacher responses to that item calculated within each school.

B-3. Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Averaged Reports¹ of Teachers within Each of 423 Schools for Computing the Pupils' Academic Performance Score

Question: Of the students you teach, what per cent. . . .

Item	Mean of Averaged Reports	Standard Deviation of Averaged Reports	Factor Weights
35. Are not mastering the subject matter skills you teach at the minimum level of satisfactory performance.	20.7	19.9	.81
33. Are one or more years behind grade level in reading ability.	31.7	26.4	.80
17. Were not adequately prepared to do the grade level work you expected of them when they entered your class (classes).	32.0	25.9	.80
11. Are <u>not</u> interested in academic achievement.	29.1	24.6	.78
15. Work up to their intellectual capacities.	43.6	28.4	-.48

¹For each item, the Averaged Reports consist of the mean of teacher responses to that item calculated within each school.

B-4. Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights of Principal Responses for Computing School Socio-Economic Status Scores

Question: What per cent of the students in your school. . . .

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Factor Weight
16. Come from homes where the father is a professional person, business executive, or manager.	17.7	21.1	495	.51
14. Come from homes where at least one parent is a college graduate.	19.6	21.5	494	.50
17. Come from homes where the father is an unskilled or semi-skilled worker.	48.3	30.2	493	-.27
15. Come from homes where neither parent has gone to school beyond high school.	58.1	30.5	495	-.37

Question: What per cent of the parents of these students. . . .

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Factor Weight
23. Have a combined family income of \$10,000 or more.	16.7	20.3	486	.45
24. Have a combined family income of less than \$5,000.	40.6	30.2	492	-.21

B-5. Means, Standard Deviations, and Factors Weights Applied to the Averaged Reports¹ of Teachers within Each of 442 Schools for Computing the Teachers' Loyalty to the Principal Score

Question: Of the teachers in your school, what per cent. . . .

Item	Mean of Averaged Reports	Standard Deviation of Averaged Reports	Factor Weights
51. Support the principal when he is being criticized by elements in the community.	84.0	12.6	.93
49. Would stand behind the principal if he were unfairly criticized by a group of parents.	86.1	11.2	.89
43. Have a personal sense of loyalty to the principal.	72.9	17.8	.74
53. Support the principal when he is under pressure from the higher administration of the school system.	70.7	15.1	.67

¹For each item, the Averaged Reports consist of the mean of teacher responses to each item calculated within each school.

B-6. Technical Details of Scale Construction: Teacher Satisfaction
with the Principals' Leadership Score

I. Item Content

- 27. The extent to which I am informed by my superiors about school matters affecting me.
- 18. The manner in which the teachers and the administrative staff work together in this school.
- 16. The method employed in this school for making decisions on pupil discipline matters.
- 19. The cooperation and help which I receive from my superiors.
- 20. The educational philosophy which seems to prevail in this school.
- 15. The method employed in this school for making decisions on curriculum matters.

II. Question, Response Alternatives and Weights

How do you feel about the following items?

<u>Response Alternatives</u>	<u>Weights</u>
Very Satisfied (VS)	6
Moderately Satisfied (MS)	5
Slightly Satisfied (SS)	4
Slightly Dissatisfied (SD)	3
Moderately Dissatisfied (MD)	2
Very Dissatisfied (VD)	1

B-10

B-6 (Continued).

III. Operational Definition of Scale

Number of Useable Cases: N = 3249

Number of Items: m = 6

Item	Definition of Positive Response	Per Cent Positive Marginal	Frequency of Item Error (e)	Per Cent of Item Error
27	VS, MS, SS	84.8	149.1	14.8
18	VS, MS	71.2	153.7	15.3
16	VS, MS	59.3	268.5	26.7
19	VS	43.9	183.5	18.5
20	VS	29.3	133.6	13.3
15	VS	18.8	<u>116.6</u>	11.6
			1005.0	

$$\text{Coefficient of Reproducibility} = 1 - \frac{\sum e}{m(N)} = 1 - \frac{1005.0}{6(3249)} = .948$$

IV. Distribution of Scale Scores

Ideal Response Pattern	Score	Frequency	Per Cent
++++++	6	421	13.0
+++++-	5	352	10.8
++++--	4	437	13.4
+++---	3	624	19.2
++-----	2	538	16.6
+-----	1	438	13.5
-----	0	<u>439</u>	13.5
		3249	

B-7. Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights¹ Applied to the Responses of 3,313 Teachers for Computing the Principals' Skill in Instructional Leadership Score

Question: How do you view the performance of your principal in each of the following areas?

Response alternatives and their weights: Outstanding (6); Excellent (5); Good (4); Fair (3); Poor (2); Very Poor (1).

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Factor Weight
12. Getting <u>experienced</u> teachers to upgrade <u>their</u> performance.	3.1	.83	.65
11. Improving the performance of <u>in-experienced</u> teachers.	2.8	.79	.62
4. Getting teachers to use new educational methods.	3.0	.74	.61
13. Giving leadership to the instructional program.	2.7	.80	.59
10. Communicating the objectives of the school program to the faculty.	2.6	.77	.57
21. Getting teachers to coordinate their activities.	2.8	.71	.56
20. Knowing about the strengths and weaknesses of teachers.	2.4	.77	.54
9. Maximizing the different skills found in a faculty.	2.6	.81	.54

¹Derived from principals' responses to the question.

B-8. Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights¹ Applied to the Responses of 3,313 Teachers for Computing the Principals' Skill in Human Relations Score

Question: How do you view the performance of your principal in each of the following areas?

Response alternatives and their weights: Outstanding (6); Excellent (5); Good (4); Fair (4); Poor (2); Very Poor (1).

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Factor Weight
6. Resolving student discipline problems.	2.3	.72	.61
16. Handling parental complaints.	2.3	.72	.60
2. Handling delicate interpersonal situations.	2.5	.80	.53
5. Obtaining parental cooperation with the school.	2.3	.80	.53
14. Developing <u>esprit de corps</u> among teachers.	2.3	.80	.50

¹Derived from principals' responses to the question.

B-9. Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights of Principal Responses for Computing the Principals' Authoritarianism Score

Question: Read each of the statements and then [give] the response which best represents your immediate reaction to the opinion expressed. Respond to each opinion as a whole. If you have reservations about some parts of the statement [give] the response which most clearly approximates your general feeling.

Response alternatives and their weights: Strongly Disagree (1); Disagree (2); Slightly Disagree (3); Slightly Agree (5); Agree (6); Strongly Agree (7).

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	N ¹	Factor Weight
1. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.	4.4	1.9	501	.67
27. What youth needs most is strict discipline, rugged determination, and the will to work and fight for family and country.	3.7	1.7	501	.60
54. Patriotism and loyalty are the first and most important requirements of a good citizen.	4.6	1.7	501	.57
42. You have to respect authority, and when you stop respecting authority, your situation isn't worth much.	5.0	1.5	501	.54
14. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel a great love, gratitude, and respect for his parents.	4.2	1.9	501	.54
63. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down.	4.2	1.7	501	.54
18. The most important qualities of a real man are determination and driving ambition.	2.8	1.6	501	.49

B-9 (Continued).

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	N ¹	Factor Weight
56. No sane, normal, decent person could ever think of hurting a close friend or relative.	3.7	1.8	501	.46
50. Our modern industrial and scientific developments are signs of a greater degree of success than that attained by any previous society.	4.3	1.8	501	.43
19. When we live in the proper way-- stay in harmony with the forces of nature, and keep all that we have in good condition, then all will go well in the world.	3.6	1.7	501	.40

¹In the case of the Value Profile from which we derived the Principals' Authoritarianism Score, all principals who did not respond to a given question were assigned a response alternative weight of (4). This method of scoring follows the procedure used by Bales and Couch; it also accounts for the fact that N = 501 on every item and for the absence of a (4) on the list of response alternatives and their weights shown above.

B-10. Technical Details of Scale Construction: Principals' Skill in
Dealing with the Community Score

I. Item Content

- 14. Gains the respect of parents when he speaks out on educational matters.
- 12. Keeps parents informed about school activities.
- 18. Makes himself available to parents who want to discuss school problems.
- 15. Handles inquiries from parents in an effective manner.
- 16. Gets support of parents when introducing new programs.
- 17. Obtains cooperation of parents of students with academic difficulties.

II. Question, Response Alternatives, and Weights

To what extent does your principal engage in the following kinds of behavior?

<u>Response Alternatives</u>	<u>Weights</u>
Always (A)	6
Almost Always (AA)	5
Frequently (F)	4
Occasionally (O)	3
Almost Never (AN)	2
Never (N)	1

B-16

B-10 (Continued).

III. Operational Definition of Scale

Number of Useable Cases: N = 3029

Number of Items: n = 6

Item	Definition of Positive Response	Per Cent Positive Marginal	Frequency of Item Error (e)	Per Cent of Item Error
14	A, AA	79.5	155.8	18.8
12	A, AA	75.8	183.8	22.1
18	A	55.4	216.8	26.1
15	A	43.2	122.7	14.8
16	A	26.1	80.9	9.7
17	A	17.5	70.1	8.4
			<u>830.1</u>	

$$\text{Coefficient of Reproducibility} = 1 - \frac{\sum e}{n(N)} = 1 - \frac{830.1}{6(3029)} = .954$$

IV. Distribution of Scale Scores

Ideal Response Pattern	Score	Frequency	Per Cent
++++++	6	424	14.0
+++++-	5	298	9.8
++++--	4	458	15.1
+++---	3	519	17.1
++-----	2	728	24.0
+-----	1	222	7.3
-----	0	380	12.5
		<u>3029</u>	

B-11. Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Derived from a Factor Analysis of Principal Self-Expectation Responses and Applied to the Reports of 3,313 Teachers for Computing the Principals' Teacher versus Pupil Interest Score¹

Question: How frequently does your principal. . . .

Response alternatives and their weights: Always (5); Almost Always (4); Occasionally (3); Almost Never (2); Never (1).

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Factor Weight
23. Encourage teachers to give extra help in their "free" periods to students needing that help.	2.0	0.84	.41
26. Put the student's welfare above that of the teachers when the two are opposed.	2.4	1.12	.41
17. Encourage worthwhile student activities that would require additional work by teachers.	2.3	0.77	.41

¹For each teacher, we obtained a score based on their responses to the three items and item weights derived from the factor analysis of principal self-expectations. These teacher scores were then averaged within each school to obtain a summary measure of each principal's behavior: the Teacher versus Pupil Interest Score.

B-12. Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights of Principal Responses for Computing the Principals' Social-Emotional Criterion for Evaluating Schools Score

Question: How much importance should be given to [each] criterion?

Response alternatives and their weights: Great Importance (4); Some Importance (3); Little Importance (2); No Importance (1).

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Factor Weight
16. The degree to which students exhibit <u>emotional</u> maturity.	1.8	.86	493	.71
15. The degree to which students exhibit <u>social</u> maturity.	1.7	.80	494	.68
22. The degree of tolerance toward fellow students of differing social backgrounds.	1.4	.72	486	.45

B-13. Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights of Principal Responses for Computing the Principals' Academic Achievement Criterion for Evaluating Schools Score

Question: How much importance should be given to [each] criterion?

Response alternatives and their weights: Great Importance (4); Some Importance (3); Little Importance (2); No Importance (1).

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Factor Weight
9. The success of former students in whatever educational institution they go to next.	1.6	0.72	492	.58
8. The proportion of students who eventually go to college.	2.2	1.01	467	.53
24. The degree of student mastery of subject matter fundamentals.	1.3	0.56	493	.46
2. The achievement test scores of students.	1.7	0.73	494	.44